

**AN INVESTIGATION OF
THE CHANGE IN POSITION OF
GEORGE SCHOLARIOS FROM
PRO-UNION OF THE WESTERN
AND EASTERN CHURCHES TO
ANTI-UNION**

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER
OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
VICTOR HENRI ANTOINE PENEL

2014

This thesis is based upon original work by the author and a study of the relevant published works as indicated and acknowledged in the text.

Signed:
(Author's signature)

Date:

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT	v
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION: CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE	1
CHAPTER TWO - RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODOLOGY - INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE THESIS.....	38
CHAPTER THREE – SCHOLARIOS AS A PHILOSOPHER	55
3.1 Philosophical Studies	55
3.2 Power of Rhetoric	64
3.3 Imperial Propaganda	73
3.4 Adaptation of Aristotle’s and Aquinas’ Works.....	81
3.5 Philosophical Significance	85
3.6 Scholarios as a Philosopher.....	93
CHAPTER FOUR – SCHOLARIOS AS A THEOLOGIAN	99
4.1 Theological Studies	99
4.2 Application of Thomistic Theology in Scholarios’ Works	101
4.3Aristotelianism versus Hesychasm	104
4.4 Misuse of Words: Summarizing, Correcting or Re-Translating?	122
4.5 Cogency as a Theologian	127
4.5 Theology as Apologia	132
4.6 Περί Ψυχῆς -De anima	135
4.7 Τοῦ Θωμᾶ, Περί Διαφορᾶς Οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι - <i>De ente et essentia</i>	140
4.8 The Two Summae: ‘ <i>Summa contra gentiles</i> ’ and ‘ <i>Summa theologiae</i> ’	145
4.9 Latin Theological Influences.....	149
CHAPTER FIVE – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PLETHON AND SCHOLARIOS	158
5.1 Aspirations and Endeavours	161
5.2 Sources of Political Vision	169
5.3 Plethon’s Hellenic Conception.....	173
5.4 Inference in the Texts of ‘ <i>De Differentiis</i> ’ and ‘ <i>Nomoi</i> ’	179
5.5 Contentious Assertions.....	183
5.6 Defence of the Byzantine Identity.....	188
5.7 State and Oikonomia	193

CHAPTER SIX –SCHOLARIOS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EAST AND WEST	201
6.1 Economic and Military Dependency.....	201
6.2 Scholarios’ Relationship with Latin Ecclesiastical Institutions	207
6.3 Procuring Positions: Papal and Latin connections	210
6.4 Political Past Events and Scholarios’ Correspondence	219
6.5 Relationship between Respective Cultures	225
6.6 Latin Language and Literature	229
CHAPTER SEVEN – SCHOLARIOS’ CHANGE IN POSITION FROM PRO-UNION TO ANTI-UNION AT THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE	236
7.1 Dialectic Political Manoeuvrings	240
7.2 Arrival of Ambassadors	245
7.3 Political Implication of the Letters.....	248
7.4 The Council and the “Economy” View of Union	252
7.5 Scholarios’ Direction to Union: Defence of the Patria	255
7.6 Critique of the Departure	259
7.7 Anti-Union Decision	263
CHAPTER EIGHT - CONCLUSION.....	275
Summary of the thesis findings: How does each chapter contribute to the conclusion? .	277
BIBLIOGRAPHY	280
Primary Sources	280
Secondary Sources	287
Articles	304

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents an examination of the change in position of George (Gennadios) Scholarios on the question of the Union of the Roman and Eastern churches. The question I will address concerns the reason for Scholarios' dramatic change of position from pro-Union to anti-Union, within a few years of the Council of Florence 1438-1439, where the Union of churches had been agreed. I will argue that Scholarios' changed position on Union is best explained by political factors that influenced his decision, and was not simply governed by the theological questions debated at the Council of Florence.

In Chapter One, the Introduction, I will introduce a critical analysis of the existing field of research, to set the thesis in the context of Scholarios scholarship that has previously been undertaken.

In Chapter Two, Research Questions and Methodology, I will outline the scope of this thesis, discussing the crucial questions that need to be addressed and the method I will use to develop my arguments.

In Chapter Three I examine the key cultural role that the philosophy of Aristotle and Aquinas played in the fifteenth century, and the extent to which Scholarios' views were formed and shaped by this philosophical context. This chapter will argue that these philosophical influences provided the initial motivation that moved Scholarios towards Union. As the implications of such political aspirations warrant further investigation; I go on to examine Scholarios' writings, not only on philosophy, but also on theology. I will explore whether the political guidance offered in taking up the study of philosophy was also to be discerned in the study of theology.

In Chapter Four, I will examine how Aristotelian philosophy was deployed as an explanatory tool in interpretations of polemics, debates, and panegyric and rhetoric works of the period. I will suggest that Byzantine preambles, poems, sermons and theological panegyrics were also subject to general imperial legislation.

In Chapter Five, I will argue that Scholarios' study of Aristotelian philosophy allowed him to form a view of how the political future of the Empire might be developed. I explore Scholarios' visionary ideas of reform and contrast these with Plethon's political perspective. I suggest that the acrimonious relationship

between Scholarios and Plethon was due to their political and philosophical differences, which defined the way they viewed the future of the Empire.

In Chapter Six, I argue that the primary key to comprehending the relationship between East and West lies in understanding the vested commercial interests. I argue the Byzantine state had deteriorated owing to foreign powers—the Italian city states, Catalanians, Franks and the Ottoman Turks—attempting to acquire and dominate the commercial and strategic political domains of the Eastern Roman Empire. This was initially driven by trade and commercial rivalry between the Latins; commercial interests also prompted the development of naval and military power by the Latins at the expense of the Eastern Roman Empire, which eventually left the Empire militarily and financially destitute. One result of this deterioration in the commercial and military power of the Empire was to allow the progressive rise in dominance of the Ottoman Turks. In light of the dangerous situation the Empire was facing, Scholarios—in the service of the imperial bureaucracy and under the dominance of the Emperor's political policy—sought to solve the dilemma and reconstruct the Empire's political power.

In Chapter Seven, I will argue that these political events, together with the political aspirations of Scholarios, led to his change of position from pro-Union to anti-Union. I will suggest that examination of the cultural, commercial and political influences in play leads to the conclusion that Scholarios' pro-Union position was primarily motivated by the objective of obtaining military aid. When it became apparent that such aid was not forthcoming, his position changed from pro-Union to anti-Union, as it was politically expedient for him to do so in light of the growing dominance of the Ottoman Turks. I argue that Scholarios followed the political policy concerning pro-Unionism proposed by Dimitrios Kydonis, and it was not until the political event of the Battle of Varna in 1444, when the Latin military forces lost to the Ottoman Turks that Scholarios formally openly declared his anti-Union stance.

In the conclusion, I will argue that, following my presentation of the evidence as outlined above, the political motivations constitute the strongest reasons for Scholarios' decision to change his stance on the Union.

This conclusion allows us to understand the vested commercial and political interests at stake, since the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine state), had deteriorated owing to the dominance of foreign powers. The ramifications are to be seen in the outcome of the Council of Florence where the Byzantines sought

the aid from the West, but also demonstrated its dependency upon them. In the light of the growing power of the Ottoman Turks, the Emperor's political policy sought to solve the dilemma and reconstruct the Empire's political power.

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION: CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

Studying the work of George Scholarios prompts the reader to raise questions about his identity, motivations and actions. Scholarios remains an enigma, for he presents various complex and contradictory aspects that scholars are still debating today. In this chapter, I examine the various interpretations of Scholarios to be found in critical accounts of his work, and show how these accounts generate the central questions of this thesis.

Scholarios was reputedly born in Constantinople at some time between 1400 and 1405. His father was from Thessaly. His mother's name was Athanasia. There are discrepancies as to the actual date of his birth; Theodore Zisis gives a lengthy explanation as to the exact date,¹ as does Christopher Turner, whereas Joseph Gill puts the date as 1405, and Franz Tinnefeld as 1403. Both parents had died no later than June 1445. He had a sister, Sophrosyne, whose son Theodore Scholarios Sophianos (1432-1456) was close to him and became one of his most loyal students and companions.² On the day of the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks, Theodore Sophianos, who had taken an active part in defence of the City, had located his uncle and tried to escape, but both were taken captive and taken to Adrianople, becoming the property of a Turkish nobleman. It was from this residence that Mehmet (or Mehmed or

¹ Theodore N. Zisis, *Gennadios II Scholarios, Life-Writings-Teachings* [Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος. Βίος-Συγγράμματα-Διδασκαλία], (Thessaloniki: Patriarchal institute for Patristic Studies, 1980), 63.

² Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 79; Franz Tinnefeld, 'George Gennadios Scholarios,' in *La Théologie Byzantine Et Sa Tradition II* eds. Carmello Guiseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, (Belgium, Turnhout Brepols Publishers, 2002), 477.

Mohammed)³ the Conqueror obtained their release in order to elevate Scholarios as patriarch.⁴

From 1420 onwards Scholarios' formative years included studying rhetoric and logic and the philosophies of Platonism, Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism. To enhance his further interest primarily in Aristotle's philosophy, Scholarios advanced to the Greek then to the Latin including also the Arab commentators, beginning with ancient and contemporary works, such as Porphyry, Ammonios, Simplicius of Cilicia, and Themistius, progressing to the Arab commentators Averroes and Avicenna, and including contemporary Byzantine philosophers Magentinos, Psellos and Philoponos. Scholarios was studying Aristotelianism as well as Platonism, but it may be conjectured that the prime purpose of these studies was the need to be able to represent himself well in both written and oral (rhetorical) delivery.⁵ He was being tutored by John Chortasmenos and Mark Eugenikos, Joseph Bryennios and Makarios of Athos. Scholarios was fifteen or twenty years old, depending on how we date his year of birth, when he began his preliminary studies.⁶ Contemporary studies suggest his tutors were

³ There are discrepancies in the actual spelling of the name, depending on the translation. See Ostrogosky for reference to the name Mohammed, Nicol for the name Mehmed and Runciman and Turner for the name Mehmet.

⁴ George Scholarios, 'Eulogy of Théodore Sophianos, nephew of Scholarios,' [Éloge de Théodore Sophianos, neveu de Scholarios], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 279-280; George Scholarios, 'Pastoral Letter after on the Capture of Constantinople,' [Lettre pastorale sur la prise de Constantinople], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*. vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris : Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 224; Christopher J.G. Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', *Byzantion, Revue Internationale des Etudes Byzantines*, (1969) : 439.

⁵ George Scholarios, 'Commentaries of Aristotle's Works' [Commentaires des Ouvrages d'Aristote], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris : Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), ii, 3. Henceforth, this author will simply be referred to as Scholarios.

⁶ Scholarios, 'Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus', [Τῷ Ἐφέσου Γεώργιου], [Lettre d'envoi de l'ouvrage précédent à Marc d'Ephèse], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*. vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 117-8, 446; George Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-First Dialogue on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Polémique antilatine-Premier dialogue sur la Procession du Saint Esprit], in *Œuvres complètes de*

embedded within the apparatus of the imperial bureaucracy and thus would have the opportunity to teach the imperial view in a form of propaganda.⁷

As a result, we might argue that Scholarios' preliminary studies in his formative years were shaped by the state. His studies in rhetoric and logic and the variance of philosophies of Platonism, Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism, from which the Byzantines drew great inspiration, especially when they confirmed Christian beliefs, would support the suggestion that Scholarios would continue his studies in this field not only for his own interest but because it was pertinent to state interests.⁸ These studies may have contributed to political discussion not only with the Latins but also with the Ottoman Turks. Scholarios' early works are philosophical in content, with an analysis of Aristotle's physics and logic; it also includes a limited edition of poetry mostly of theological content.⁹ Even though certain works of Logic were limited in the West there were original Greek texts in Constantinople, which Scholarios would have been able to access. In Scholarios' collected works there is also an incomplete translation and commentary of Aristotle. The *Organon* includes the six works of Logic by Aristotle (Categories, On Interpretations, Prior Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Topics, Sophistical Refutations), but certain sections were not included in Scholarios' commentaries. We must bear in mind that most of Scholarios works were lost after 1453 due to the Fall of

Gennadios Scholarios. vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris : Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 7 ; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 422-424; Niketas Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: Illumination and Utopia in Gemistos Plethon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 62.

⁷ Dimiter Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 15.

⁸ Bertrand Russell, 'The Italian Renaissance', in *A History of Western Philosophy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc, 1945), 501; Ted Honderick, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 70; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 423-424. As Mark Eugenikos had studied under the renowned Platonist Gemistos Plethon, in his role as tutor for Scholarios would suggest this field of Platonic studies was undertaken also by Scholarios.

⁹ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works-Translation of a Hymn Synesius', [Œuvres poétiques-Traduction d'une hymne Synésius], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 369-397.

Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks, which means that the extent of the work we have of Scholarios concerning philosophy is limited. Scholarios added his commentaries to Aquinas' existing analysis of Aristotle. Certainly there seem to be discontinuous sections regarding the Categories, Physics and Metaphysics in volumes VI and VII. In the introduction to volume VI Scholarios adds marginal notes to Aquinas' commentaries on the works of Aristotle, but these refer only to certain passages of the first three books of Aristotle's Physics.¹⁰ The commentaries by Thomas Aquinas on the Physics of Aristotle are translated by Scholarios, but they stop at the 12th lesson of book II. This offers another good example of discontinuities in Scholarios' texts concerning philosophy.¹¹ There are a number of discrepancies in terms of what counts original philosophical texts of Scholarios, but also questions as to the authenticity of certain texts.¹²

The foremost theological works are dated from 1444, and comprise of rebuttals against the Roman Church on the doctrine of Filioque Clause, re-translation and summaries of Thomas Aquinas philosophical /theological works of *De anima*, *De ente et essentia* and including two major work of the *Summae* and analytical apologia of the Christian faith.¹³ These are mostly observations and summaries of Aquinas work, but also include Scholarios' correspondences with various Byzantine and Western elites.

¹⁰ Scholarios, 'Introduction', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), v-vi.

¹¹ Scholarios, 'Introduction' in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*. vol.VI. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris : Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), xii

¹² Stratis Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos, Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 31.

¹³ Scholarios, 'Resume of the Summary against the Gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas', [Résumé de la Somme contre les Gentils de Saint Thomas d'Aquin], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.V. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1931), 1-337. The volume entails commentary on Thomas Aquinas' Works on 'Summary against Gentiles', [Somme contre les Gentils or Summa contra Gentiles] and the beginning section of 'Summary of Theology', [Somme Théologique or Summa theologiae: In the French/ Latin titles]; Scholarios, 'Summary of Theology', [Somme Théologique], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VI.

A review of Scholarios' correspondences in this period with Papal and Western secular powers reveals not only a political and theological administrative and ecclesiastical identity continuous with the outlook of the imperial authority, but also reveals his personal aspirations, particularly his search for a position within their administrative organization. Scholarios' political ambition was discernible even in his early correspondence.

We may speculate that Mark Eugenikos, as tutor and close friend of Scholarios, had a strong influence on his thinking.¹⁴ Scholarios' tutors Joseph Bryennios, Makarios of Athos, and Mark Eugenikos, were staunch adherents to the Palamite tradition, which would suggest all these individuals had the potential to affect Scholarios' predisposition to anti-Unionism.¹⁵

Scholars raise many questions about the true identity of Scholarios. There is even division about the question of his name: George Kourtesis (Courtesis), or George Gennadios Scholarios. Some scholars assert that there was in fact a multiplicity of persons behind the name (or names). For some, to suggest more than one person is responsible for the writings is the only possible explanation for the dramatic difference in the pro-Unionist and anti-Unionist works ascribed to Scholarios: that the writings were in fact products of different people that were brought together under the same name.

eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides ((Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), 1-326. This volume VI, as the previous volume number V consist of commentaries on Thomas Aquinas major work of *Somme Théologique*. It also includes the work *De Anima* (Περὶ Ψυχῆς) that Scholarios was to re-translate and comment upon.

¹⁴ Nicholas Basileidis, 'St Mark Evenikos and the Union of the Churches', [Ο Ἅγιος Μάρκος Ο Εὐγενικός καὶ Ἡ Ἐνῶσις τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν], (Athens: *The Theological Brotherhood 'O Sotir'*, 1998), 48.

¹⁵ George Barrois, 'Palamism Revisited,' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 19, 4. (1975): 4, 220-231; Antonio Rigo, 'Gregory of Sinai', [Gregorio IL Sinaita], in *La Théologie Byzantine et sa Tradition II*, eds. Carmello Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, (Belgium: Turnhout Brepols Publishers, 2002), 35-73.

In his article “The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius” in *Byzantion*, Volumn (Tome) 1969, Turner suggests Scholarios’ studies in Latin philology and philosophies were concurrent with his service with Emperor John VIII Palaiologos at the court of Constantinople in 1420, which would indicate a Latin influence. The titles Scholarios had received from 1437-1440 of Didaskalos (teacher) of Theology, Private Chancellor (La Chancellerie Privée) and The Emperor’s Chief Imperial Secretary (L’empereur and Chef du Secrétariat Imperial), further indicate that Scholarios was politically ambitious and was held in some esteem in the imperial court.

So as previously stated, Scholarios’ age when he was first present at court is estimated to be from fifteen to twenty years old, depending on the actual year of his birth, a relatively young, aspiring and brilliant scholar, who perhaps already saw opportunities for his own advancement.¹⁶

So to what extent did Scholarios transcend the ecclesiastical and political boundaries of his day? If one individual is the source both of the correspondence with Papal and Western offices in the period 1430-1439, and propagator of the pro-Union settlement at the Council of Florence, but also the individual who is the author of anti-Union literature, particularly after 1444, then we must suggest there must be a reason for this dichotomy. The premise of this thesis will be that the study of rhetoric and logic was not arbitrarily selected, and was not studied just to elucidate philosophical terminology — the use of reason and argument to seek explanations of causes—but rather to be able to use philosophy for specific political reasons.

¹⁶ Hugh Christopher Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus De Bellovisu on the De Ente Et Essentia of Thomas Aquinas*, Studi Tomistici, 53 (Città Del Vaticano: Libreria editrice vaticana, 1993), 10.

However, the complexities of his actions in ecclesiastical terms does seem to support the hypothesis that there was actually a multiplicity of individuals who were assumed to be one person with the name of Scholarios, and we need to explore this hypothesis in the literature if we are to contest it successfully. The uncertainty about his identity has fuelled debate in academic Byzantine studies about whether the information, historical records and writings by and about George Scholarios concern the same person, or perhaps many persons going by the name of George Scholarios. The majority of Scholarios' correspondence and works, even those of doubtful authenticity, are to be found in various academic institutions and libraries that are situated in various part of the world. The works of Monsignor Louis Petit, Xenophon Sideridis and Fr. Martin Jugie on the collection of Scholarios' works, consisting of his early correspondences, his poetry, but mostly of his theological and philosophical works primarily written after 1444, have aided academic studies in this field. In addition, V Laurent, the *Mémoires* of Sylvester Syropoulos and also *Vera Historia Unionis non Verae*, abridged by Robertus Creyghton in the proceedings, prior and during the Council of Florence, are primary sources.¹⁷ Lately scholars such as Joseph Gill, Christopher Turner, Hugh Christopher Barbour, Theodore Zisis and Marie-Hélène Blanchet¹⁸ have aided in the further insight

¹⁷ Sylvester Syropoulos, *History of the Council of Florence* [*Historia Concilii Florentini*], commented and translated in Latin, by Robertus Creyghton titled, *Vera Historia Unionis Non Verae Inter Graecos Et Latinos: Sive Concilii Florentini Exactissima Narratio, Graece Scripta Per Sylvestrum Sguropulum Magnum Ecclesiarcham, atque Unum è quinque Crucigeris & intimis Consiliariis Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, Qui Concilio Interfuit* (Hagae-Comitis: ex Typographia Adriani Vlacq, 1660) In this thesis all annotations to this work will be annotated as *Vera Historia Unionis Non Verae*; Sylvester Syropoulos, *The Memoirs* [Απομνημονεύματων] commented and translated in French by V. Laurent and titled, *Les Mémoires Du Grand Ecclésiarque De L'Eglise De Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos Sur Le Concile De Florence (1438-1439)* (Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1971.) This work will be annotated in the French annotation as *Mémoires* throughout this thesis.

¹⁸ Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence, and other Essays* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), 7; Christopher J.G. Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 18.1 (April 1967): 86; Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 40; Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 31; Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (circa 1400-vers 1472) an intellectual Orthodox facing the demise of the Byzantine Empire* [*Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472)*], *Un intellectuel Orthodoxe face à la Disparition de L'Empire Byzantin* (Paris: Institut Français D'Études Byzantines, 2008), 47-60.

into Scholarios' character and behaviour. Zisis particularly has suggested that Scholarios' works that reflected any pro-Union sympathies were actually altered, having been written by someone other than Scholarios or having been interfered with by pro-Latin sympathisers.

We are prompted to ask the following question: if one individual is the source of pro- and anti-Union works, then, at what point in time did Scholarios' change of opinion from pro-Union to anti-Union commence? Additionally, what motivated Scholarios' change of attitude towards Union? Christopher Turner suggests that: "modern scholarship has largely clarified his successive attitudes, but their chronology and motivation remain open to dispute". This thesis will take up the challenge of a response to this statement.¹⁹

Theodore Zisis follows this line of enquiry by drawing upon an earlier scholar, Leo Allatios, who had already noted Scholarios' change in his attitude towards Union:

"Little wonder then, the learned seventeenth century Byzantinist Leo Allatios could find no better resolution than to discover three individuals, alike only in name and nationality who might account for the variety and breadth of the mind of Gennadios Scholarios".²⁰

Zisis refers to Allatios here because he also re-asserts the argument about the multiplicity of persons, in his endeavour to find a solution for Scholarios' problematic change. He agrees with Allatios that this position is the only credible one.

¹⁹ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 421.

²⁰ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 1.

Zisis reasons that various names were associated with the name Scholarios, such as Kourtesis. Thus there is some legitimacy in the suggestion that more than one person could be credited with the name of Scholarios, and this may explain the diverse images of Scholarios and why his change in position could be attributed to different individuals, particularly in the period 1439 to 1444.

However, in his discussion of the ‘adulterate’ explanation of Scholarios’ change, Zisis suggests it is inconceivable that Scholarios could be so inconsistent with the viewpoint of his mentor and spiritual father Mark Eugenikos on the topic of Union.²¹ Zisis promotes the view that all pro-Union views ascribed to Scholarios could only be the revisions of pro-Unionists Greeks or the translation of Scholarios’ works by Roman Church propagandists.²²

In his discussion of Scholarios’ various names, Turner concurs with Zisis’s view about ‘*adulteration*’. In his article entitled ‘The Career of George–Gennadius Scholarius’, Turner gives credibility to the use of the name of Kourtesis by stating that it had appeared on some of Scholarios’ earlier work and that the name was a courtly and latinized name—originally Kontos or Kolobos, having derived from the female branch (i.e. metronymic) of the Scholarios family. Zisis ascribes this point of view to Professor K. Mponis (Bonis) of the University of Athens.²³ However, Zisis differs from Turner regarding the question of whether the name Kourtesis had been used in conjunction with the name Scholarios. He disputes the the name Kourtesis was ever used by Scholarios, arguing that it was neither altered to another name nor was it used intermittently by him.

²¹ Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 68.

²² Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, 79; Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 31-59, 64–71; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius’, 421.

²³ Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 42.

He asserts instead, that the name belongs to another individual.²⁴ Nevertheless, scholars such as Joseph Gill and Martin Jugie²⁵ have argued Zisis' argument is too dogmatic, and that we cannot absolutely rule out the use of the name Kourtesis.

If the argument for the successive attitudes of Scholarios convincingly suggests one person is responsible, then there must be a motive for Scholarios' alteration on the subject of Union: if so, what were the motivations behind the change? Turner asserts we can be sure that Scholarios is just one person: "We may now be certain that the Scholarios who was to become the protagonist of the anti-Unionist cause at the death of Mark Eugenikos in 1445 was the same Scholarios as had outspokenly advocated Union at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438–9".²⁶

Zisis confirms Gill's view about the adulterate theme of Scholarios work, and argues that all the pro-Union texts were altered by the "gang of Bessarion", who were pro-Unionist. Zisis defends his argument by agreeing with Gill—that certain parts of the texts relating to the minutes of the Council written by Syropoulos were the property and product of John Plousiadenos.²⁷ However, Zisis therefore concludes that Plousiadenos was the conduit of the altered texts that were pro-Union. Zisis continues by arguing that, since Plousiadenos was the proponent of the texts, then Plousiadenos, together with Joseph Methonis, was in fact the pro-Unionist, and not Scholarios.²⁸ But if the texts relating to the minutes of the Council by Syropoulos were adulterated by "Bessarion's gang," then, according to Zisis so were the earlier works of Scholarios. Thus Scholarios

²⁴ Ibid. 68.

²⁵ Gill's work on The 'Acta' and 'Memoires of Syropoulos' presents the argument for a multiplicity of persons and the subject of alteration, based on the work of Allatios. This is also the view of Jugie.

²⁶ Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence', 83.

²⁷ Joseph Gill, *Church Union: Rome and Byzantium (1204–1453)* (Variorum Reprints, London. 1979), 137.

²⁸ Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 389.

is exonerated from any pro-Union affiliation, according to Zisis.²⁹ In other words, all the works relating to Union were falsified, and thus forgeries. Zisis's argument was, as Livanos points out, that the falsification of the works was undertaken to demonstrate the dominance and the victory of the Latins over the Greeks in the matters of dogmas and also of the Greek Church.³⁰ The difference between Gill and Zisis is that Gill presents his arguments in carefully accredited research, whereas Zisis presents his work as a polemical defence to expiate any accusation of Unionism on the part of Scholarios. Zisis's exoneration of Scholarios of any pro-Union affiliation is considered by many to be highly exaggerated. Barbour states the work is "so egregiously lacking in seriousness and so clearly polemical that it would be a waste of time to refute it directly."³¹

Livanos continues by stating, "While allegations of a conspiracy to suppress the real Scholarios are far-fetched, they, like most conspiracy theories, originate in a fact whose significance has been greatly exaggerated".³² Livanos makes a point of this remark for he attributes the allegations of multiplicity to Martin Jugie, stating that he was unsympathetic to late Byzantine spirituality and found Scholarios appealing precisely because his Augustinianism and Thomism made him unusual.

In the introduction to his book *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, Barbour begins with an insightful observation about Scholarios, where he states: "Gennadios was simply inconsistent, inconstant in his opinions, motivated by considerations of career or party, even dishonest, unscrupulously vain, a brilliant man

²⁹ Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 386–7.

³⁰ Ibid. 377.

³¹ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 10. See foot note 7: Christopher Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios, Alone against All of Europe* (Piscataway, NJ: First Gorgias Press, 2006), 122.

³² Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 122.

for whom scholarship was simply an instrument for personal advancement.”³³ Although this is a negative description of Scholarios, it is perceptive; it underlines the political endeavours in all of Scholarios activities.

Barbour and Zisis are directing their readers towards a specific point of view of Scholarios. For Barbour, Scholarios’ works are seen “within the rigorous bound of an ecclesial and social Orthodoxy”³⁴, which he affirms as Byzantine Thomism. For Zisis, as stated, the multiplicity of persons is implicit in the theory of adulteration of certain works. Barbour and Zisis both argue certain translations were not Scholarios’ own work, or they were adulterated so they could be assumed to be his. It can be asserted that Barbour’s accusation of Scholarios as a plagiarist of certain literary works of others is in the same vein as Zisis’s theory of adulteration.

In fact, both Barbour and Zisis do have something in common; they are highlighting the same sort of charge, respectively of adulteration and plagiarism. Barbour alleges that some of Scholarios’ philosophical works on Thomas Aquinas were plagiarised from already translated works of the Dominican friar Armandus De Bellovisu. For Zisis, the pro-Unionist works of Scholarios were adulterated by Roman Church revisionism for the purpose of propaganda.³⁵

The topic of the multiplicity of persons is presented by Christopher Livanos in the last chapter of his book. However, he does not examine the issue of multiplicity of persons as Zisis does, but rather, alludes to it, giving the reason of divergent philosophical and

³³ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 10.

³⁴ Ibid. 26.

³⁵ Gill, *Church Union*, 156–161. Gill does not write not so much about the alteration Scholarios’ own works, but he does claim the ‘Acts’ or ‘Practica of Syropoulos’ were altered.

theological differences as to why the multiplicity exists.³⁶ A close examination of the chapter entitled: '*Fallen Cities, Orientalism and Rhetoric*' indicates he is not referring directly to the reasoning for Scholarios' choice in advocating Union, but is examining the effects of the persuasive philosophical and theological terminologies used by Scholarios to argue about the issues that were paramount at that time.³⁷

Although the explanation of the multiplicity of persons and adulterated or alternated texts are simplified answers to Scholarios' change in position, if Scholarios was the same person who attended the Council of Florence as the person who was the main protagonist against the Union, then a chronological study is necessary to explain the change in Scholarios' position from his pro-Union advocacy to his anti-Union stance after the year 1445 and his motive for this change.

One key argument is that Scholarios' reason for his "pursuit of scholastic studies was to develop a deeper understanding of Western theology in order to refute it more effectively and find a common ground in order to obtain a political solution for the defence of the imperial state".³⁸ The subject of defence and pecuniary assistances is introduced by Turner and Livanos, albeit briefly, as the source for the desired Union of the churches, even though this is not articulated explicitly, which would suggest an essential political motivation to his change.³⁹

³⁶ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 117–120. Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 93.

³⁷ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon,' [Polémique contre Gémistos Pléthon], in (*Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 4, 117; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 95–110.

³⁸ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon,' vol.IV.5; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 122; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism*, 347. The section that is annotated by Siniossoglou is perceptive for it outlines the political motives behind the studies of philosophy and theology by Scholarios, as well as Kydonis and Plethon.

³⁹ Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence', 90, 96.

Livanos and Martin Jugie take this position on Scholarios' change in position. However, they see the motive for the change as primarily theoretical and cultural, locating it in the setting of philosophical, theological arguments, and not in the reality of the political manoeuvrings of the time. The ultimate reasoning they give for Scholarios' change in position does not concern the reality of external circumstances, but rather, they claim, reflects a personal and internal decision.

Christopher Turner's two articles titled, 'George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence,' and 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios,' were written almost fifty years ago. Even though it is nearly a half century since these articles were written, the information in the historical analysis is informative and apposite for the examination of Scholarios, particularly as to the reason for his change to a pro-Union stance. Turner approaches his work by first addressing the problem of Scholarios' change and systematically explains, albeit briefly, the progress of his change. The information provided by Turner is exceptionally clear and convincing.

Turner argues that Scholarios developed an independent interest in philological study, which was not simply in the service of the imperial bureaucracy.⁴⁰ He briefly argues that Scholarios' tutors could not have instructed him beyond initial philological studies, because of their own limitations in this field.⁴¹ Instead, Turner suggests Scholarios was further influenced by studies from the Latin monasteries in Constantinople.⁴² The observation that Scholarios' further philological studies were obtained from his association with the Latin monastic institutions in Constantinople appears to add fresh

⁴⁰ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 423-424.

⁴¹ Scholarios, 'Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus', vol. IV.117-8.

⁴² George Scholarios, 'Accord of the Eastern and Western Fathers', [Τῶν δυτικῶν διδασκάλων προχείρως καὶ ἀληθῶς πρὸς τοὺς Ἀσιανοὺς], [Accord des Pères orientaux et occidentaux], in *Euvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.II. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1931), 401, v.12-14; Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic,' vol. III. 7, 18-22.

insights to his field of influences.⁴³ It is rarely accounted for in the literature, and scholars often overlook the fact that these institutions were completely entrenched and were a dominant power in the city.⁴⁴ Turner further emphasises the literary works of Scholarios, in particular translations and the commentary on ‘On Being and Essence’, [*De ente et essentia*] to support his case, although Barbour discredits the notion that Scholarios personally translated this particular work.

Another theme that is crucial in understanding the impetus of Scholarios’ anti-Union change which is often omitted or mentioned only in passing (other than by Turner and the recent work of Blanchet), is the hostility towards him at court after the year 1445.⁴⁵ Scholarios expressed dissatisfaction with the court, because the court remained obstinately Unionist. This conflict between the court and the individual is vital in understanding why Scholarios changed position on the topic of Union to anti-Union, because it indicates he was politicised by his studies, and also indicates the need to take into account the context in which he lived. This question takes us back to the question of the significance of Scholarios’ source of Latin learning, if Scholarios’ changed position on the question of Union is seen as a merely personal decision. I will go on to suggest the decision to change was not motivated by one event, but by a series of political occurrences in the process. Scholarios was one of many protagonists in the endeavour towards achieving Union; he certainly was not the only one, for this action was to be achieved communally and not solely by an individual. In order to understand

⁴³ Donald MacGillivray Nicol. *Byzantium and Venice: A study in diplomatic and cultural relations* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press. 1988), 379. MacGillivray Nicol writes: ‘For the emperor believed that the success of the council was the last hope of salvation for Constantinople.’ The account would refer to a political motive rather than solely theological matter.

⁴⁴ Scholarios, ‘Justification Discours of Scholarios accused of Latinism’ [Discours justificatif de Scholarios accusé de latinisme], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 381–6; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 264.

⁴⁵ Scholarios, ‘Polemical against Gemistos Plethon,’ vol.IV. 10–23, 32–33; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios,’ 423.

his shift in position we must look beyond a reductive psychological account of motive, and examine the broader context of his work to comprehend what Scholarios was aiming to achieve.

As noted above Turner emphasises Scholarios' aspiring and ambitious nature. Turner argues that Scholarios' change in opinion to Union was due to dissatisfaction and thwarted ambition, stemming from conflicting inclinations inherent in his own character.⁴⁶ He offers an account of a change in attitude that, as Livanos states, is reflected in the division that existed between East and West in cultural and theological spheres and was replicated within Scholarios.⁴⁷ As I will argue, suggesting that Scholarios' decision to change was caused only by his personal, philosophical and theological opinions mis-characterises the context and the real motives for Scholarios' change of position. To elide, eliminate or overlook key aspects of Scholarios' context that make an important contribution to his altered position, risks fundamentally misconstruing the nature of the change.⁴⁸

Turner presents his research on Scholarios through reflecting on Scholarios' work in a historical sequence of events, elaborating the personal aspects of Scholarios' life—his birth, the education he received, his position within the court, and so forth.⁴⁹ This contextualisation is essential if we are to fully grasp both the background and the

⁴⁶ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 436.

⁴⁷ Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, see 63–6, relating to the details of Scholarios' birth date.

⁴⁸ Dimitar Angelov, 'The Power and Subversion in Byzantium: approaches and frameworks', in *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, ed. Dimitar Angelov and Michael Saxby, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publication 17. (Surrey England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 3.

⁴⁹ Martin Jugie, Christopher Turner and Theodore Zisis have presented and explained their various opinions as to the exact date of Scholarios' birth. According to sources, records of Scholarios' birth show some discrepancies as to the exact date; these vary from 1400, 1403 to 1405. Even though Zisis systematically analyses the dates of Scholarios' birth and argues for the accuracy of the date, inconsistencies remain. Jugie and Turner simply avoid the intricate data of the dates of Scholarios' birth and provide general simple explanations. See Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 423; Scholarios, 'Philosophical Works,' [Oeuvres de Georges Scholarios, Oeuvres Philosophiques], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*. vol.VIII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 20; Zisis, *Gennadios B Scholarios*, 64.

implications of his decision to change sides, but this thesis will seek to establish an extended version of this contextual account.

As previously stated, his tutors in the preliminary studies of philology and philosophy were part of an imperial administrative organisation, and thus we can conjecture that Scholarios' course of studies must have been inherently political. In his book, *'Imperial Ideology and Political thought in Byzantium, 1204–1330'*, Dimiter Angelov offers an investigation of imperial propaganda during the Laskaris and early Palaiologan eras, and provides a convincing reason for Scholarios' introduction to the studies of Aristotle. A closer examination of the purpose of such study, Angelov suggests, would indicate that this was the predominant influence, exercised within the imperial bureaucracy and perpetuated for political reasons within the court and with the Byzantine relationship with the Latins and the Ottoman Turks:

“Rhetoric, rather than law, was the main vehicle for the expression of late Byzantine political thought. As is known, rhetoric is the art of persuasive use of language; Rhetoric being a discipline of Aristotle theoretical philosophy and as a discipline, rhetoric provided both genres and a language for couching political theories”.⁵⁰

I will go on to suggest the notion of rhetoric as a political tool would have formed the basis for Scholarios' philological and philosophical studies.

⁵⁰ Alexander Kazhdan, 'On Demetrios Chomatenos', in *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander Kazhdan, vol 1 (New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 426. See also Angelov for reference to Demetrios Chomatenos' statements on the limitations of imperial power in which Angelov ascribes to his political theories. There is a discrepancy as to the spelling of the name, even though the name is sometimes written as Chomatenos, there is another variation of the name written as Chomateianos, in Greek [Χωματειανος], which would be the nearest to the correct spelling of the name. See P.G.119 in the index; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought*, 18.

At the start of his discussion of Byzantine Thomism, Barbour focusses primarily on Scholarios as an ambitious political agent, in order to show how his studies and scholarship both inspired and reinforced his aspirations. Scholarios is described as “a brilliant man for whom scholarship was simply an instrument for personal advancement”.⁵¹ Barbour introduces this negative description in order to clarify the part that Byzantine Thomism plays in shaping his views.⁵² The description of Scholarios offers a further insight into the motive for Scholarios’ altered state towards Union; even though it provides a negative description of Scholarios it reinforces the extent to which there is a political edge to Scholarios’ ideas and actions.

Barbour continues to clarify the terminology of Byzantine Thomism by stating that “Byzantine Thomism cannot be a theological Thomism, even with a majority of Thomas Aquinas’ theological conclusions, primarily because it does not necessarily accept what is a formally unifying element, a first principle of Aquinas’ theological reasoning: the Universal Roman Magisterium”⁵³

What Barbour claims is that the concept of Thomas Aquinas’ theological speculations was not fully understood, nor any were attempts made to understand the arguments by the Byzantines, but a superficial outline of Thomas’ philosophical and theological speculations was studied as long as it concurred with the theological and cultural precepts of the Byzantines. The key term that Barbour asserts is the word ‘Magisterium’, for here the term refers to those who interpret the word of God, which has been entrusted exclusively to the Roman Church. Barbour's terminology concerning the authentic Thomism is intrinsically tied to the theological dogmas of the Roman

⁵¹ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 10.

⁵² Ibid. 18, 38–9.

⁵³ Ibid. 39.

Church. Byzantine Thomism then would entail a Byzantine accepting certain elements of the theology of Aquinas and not the dogmas of the Roman Church; thus, for Barbour, this excludes the Byzantine Thomist from being a true Thomist, because he would be unable to accept the dogmas of the Roman Church.

I would suggest that Barbour is accurate in this interpretation of Byzantine Thomism. Even if it accepts most of Aquinas' theological reasoning, which the Orthodox Byzantines would not accept, the key aspect of being a theologically correct Thomist would be in the application of the Universal Roman Magisterium, a theological precept. Barbour's description suggests Scholarios is an ambitious political negotiator.

Livanos suggests that Byzantine Thomism is fundamentally concerned with philosophical concepts and not theology. This argument highlights some key differences between East and West. Livanos admits that a few communicated from their "enclosed culture" concerning their acceptance and admiration of Thomas Aquinas, but where negative opinions were expressed, they were applied to the term Byzantine Thomism and formulated with prejudice against the Byzantines.⁵⁴ He writes; "culturally, Byzantium was not inclined to the formation of the sort of schools and movements which flourished in the Latin Middle Ages". There may have been attempts to exclude or minimise such developments. Attempts to study Aquinas' theological precepts were met with suspicion, and "such movements in Byzantium were viewed with suspicion as subversive or heterodox". This would indicate a political problem under the canopy of theological assertiveness practised by the Roman Church.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Ibid. 33, 34.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 38.

The study of philosophy and theology was paramount in the Byzantine Empire. To deny that the East experienced any cultural development, while the West progressed and transformed itself, is to demonstrate a limited knowledge of the East and its philosophical, theological developments, let alone its political relevance. This is a distortion at any period of its existence, and a misinterpretation.

To suggest that Platonism was considered to be the product of Satan by the Byzantines is incorrect.⁵⁶ Platonism (and neo-Platonism) was reintroduced by Michael Psellos in the eleventh century, and despite the fact that Patriarch Xiphilinos represents Psellos' interest in pagan philosophers very negatively, this did not deter continued interest and research.⁵⁷

The claim that Barbour makes about the Byzantines concerning the inheritance of classical *paideia*, emphasises conformity in the cultural and theological inheritance, which hindered the acceptance and the development of different movements or schools. Byzantines were perceived as having high opinions of themselves. However, this did not pertain to the Byzantines alone, but also to the Latins, which Barbour chooses not to emphasize. This point of view implies that there was no progressive development of intellectual study either in this field or in any other.⁵⁸

Livanos directly addresses the claim about the closed nature of the culture by identifying differences between the two world views, but showing how they impacted on each other. In contrast, Barbour implies the Byzantines were conformist and non-

⁵⁶ Ibid. 26.

⁵⁷ Frances Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones, c.1324-c.1397: Intellectual and Diplomatic relations between Byzantium and the West in the Fourteenth Century* (New York: Fordham University, 1981), 84; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought in Byzantium*, 15; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 1. There is a major difference that is presented by Kianka on this subject of Platonic studies and by Angelov on Aristotelian studies and likewise by Siniossoglou in his recent studies.

⁵⁸ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 42–3.

progressive. Not knowing each other's languages is cited as an example of one specific obstacle.⁵⁹ In fact, more Byzantines transferred to other cultures and learned their languages than the Latins did towards the Byzantines.⁶⁰ Turner presents an alternative image of Scholarios and Byzantine society when he states: "Scholarios perceived himself as the prime Aristotelian expert, whose teaching advocated the extension of Aristotelian authority beyond the Byzantine norm, to embrace also the Thomist assimilation of Aristotle into a Christian synthesis to develop as a vehicle for the expression of Byzantine political thought." He continues to elaborate, stating: "Scholarios wanted the cultural heritage of Byzantium to be expanded by the inclusion of the fruits of Latin scholarship."⁶¹ "For as a student of Aristotle, Scholarios was understandably interested in Aquinas, who was almost universally acclaimed as the greatest interpreter of Aristotle".⁶²

If the view that Barbour offers is accepted, then it runs the risk of negating the period of the Laskarid/Vatatzes Dynasty during the Nicaean Empire 1204-1261, which saw a reinvigorated interest in scholarship, particularly philosophy, by eminent refugees from the Latin domination of Constantinople, such as Niketas Choniates, Nicholas Mesarites and Nikephoros Blemmydes. This period initiated the renaissance of renewed interest in the study of philosophy and promoted individuals to advance the cause of studies that was to influence the Byzantine and subsequently the Italian humanists.⁶³ Barbour

⁵⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21.

⁶⁰ N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*. (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1983), 49; Deno John Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissance*, (Hamden Conn: Archon Books, 1973), Introduction.1

⁶¹ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 430; George Karamanolis, 'Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle,' in *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou, (Oxford: Clarendon Press.2002), 253.

⁶² Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21.

⁶³ Alexander Alexandrovich Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324-145*, second English edition, vol.II. (Madison. WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952), 549; Alexander Kazhdan, 'Laskaris and Nicaea' in *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander Kazhdan, vol 2 (New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 1180, 1463-1464.

also runs the risk of negating the influence of Plethon on Florentine society, as the influence of the Byzantines would not have ensued without it.⁶⁴ We must question why Barbour appears to deny the study of philosophy by Westerners, who came seeking to advance their knowledge in the fourteenth century in this field, in the schools of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire.

Barbour denies there was any important contribution by Byzantines to advance higher research in philosophical studies, summarising as follows: “Too little Plato, merely Aristotelian logic, too much theology”.⁶⁵ However, we may suggest, this was not actually the reality. Vasilev writes that to say that “Constantinople, with its surroundings, and the Morea were not centres of ardent culture, both intellectual and artistic pursuits, is not the case.”⁶⁶ Although the Eastern Roman Empire experienced a gradual demise as a political force, it underwent instead a reassertion of cultural interests, both intellectual and artistic.

“The Schools of Constantinople flourished as they had in her most brilliant past, and students came not only from the far-off Greek regions, like Sparta or Trebizond, but even from Italy, at that time in the height of the Renaissance”.⁶⁷

Conversely, there are many examples of flourishing culture, for example, individuals such as the historian George Pachymeres, author of a rhetorical exercise which emulated the earliest Greek classical developments in this subject, set by Hermogenes. The purpose of the exercise was to enhance the method of rhetoric presentation and the

⁶⁴ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, .29; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 93.

⁶⁵ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 25.

⁶⁶ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 687.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

results are discernible in his historical writings.⁶⁸ Pachymeres maintained the method of fashioning oratorical rhetoric as a philosophical practice which was strongly influenced by classical models of historiography and rhetoric. In as such, late antique handbooks of Hermogenes, Aphthonios, and Menander were extensively studied by the Byzantines to enhance the art of articulation of speech and written delivery.⁶⁹ The practice of extolling the virtues or disparaging the behaviours of individuals, be they emperors or of lower status was a common trope, and this was imitated by later Byzantine historians.⁷⁰ This method of rhetorical elucidation was strictly imitated in the historical account of Emperor Michael Palaiologos by Pachymeres and is perceived in Scholarios' letters and works.⁷¹ These endeavours by Pachymeres in scholarship were not limited to the course of rhetoric, but also emerge in his method of Quadrivium [(arithmetical, music, geometry and astronomy),⁷² and were subsequently utilized by the Byzantines and Italian Humanists. We can discern how Scholarios also utilised these sources in his initial

⁶⁸ Georgii Pachymerae, *Michael Palaeologus* P.G.143, 443A-453A: Nikephoros Gregoras, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*. Auguste Immanuel Bekker and Barthold Georg Nieburhr. CSHB, Schopeni Edition. (Bonn: University of Bonn: c.1828-1897), 65; Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West. 1258-1282 A study in the Byzantine –Latin Relations*. (Hamden CT: Archon Books. 1973), 36-39; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 22, 202.

⁶⁹ Nikephoros Gregoras, 'Scriptural Body of Byzantine History', [Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae], P.G.148, 119A-1450B. See the biographical explanation of Nikephoros Gregoras life especially relating to the rhetorical studies. In reading the historical account of Gregoras, it is clear that the method of presentation reflects a rhetorical methodology; Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos. Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*, 29, 31, 39, 51-56. The essential primary studies in the process of philosophical studies were grammar and poetry; it is evocative of Scholarios' initial introduction to philosophical studies; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18. See on pages 51 and 52 of this thesis on the subjects of studies by Byzantine scholars.

⁷⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 256; George Pachymeres [Γεωργιος Παχυμερης-Pachymerae], *Michael Palaeologus* P.G.143, 443A-996B. The example that is cited by Angelov as the two historians of this period emulating the classical method of philosophical and rhetorical presentation as Nikephoros Gregoras and Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos focused on (tyche)-luck as a force governing human affairs, which is reflective of Pachymeres' utilizing the word (moira)-fate. What is apparent of Pachymeres and later historians and Byzantine scholars is their ardent adherence to the classical studies.; Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)* The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1976), 77-84; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 256.

⁷¹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephesus', [A Marc d'Ephèse], and 'Response to Lue Notaras, son-in-law of the Emperor', [Réponse à Lue Notaras, gendre de l'empereur], in (*Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 445-449, 460-462.

⁷² Frederick B. Artz, *The Mind of the Middle Ages* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953). 310.

studies of philosophy,⁷³ in his rhetorical and theological treatises, as well as in his summary of Aristotelian philosophy.

This wealthy heritage incorporated into the Byzantine society from their ancient past simply stimulated a further growth of literature and historical exploration. Maximos Planoudis, renowned anthologist, philologist and interpreter⁷⁴ whose knowledge of Latin was remarkable was a product of this motivation to enhance further studies in literature, West or East.⁷⁵ This was especially noteworthy as at that period there was intense enmity between the Latins and Byzantines; however, Planoudis explored and edited manuscript texts of Plutarch and Ptolemy, and also translated texts of Augustine's *De trinitate*, which Scholarios was to utilise in his research.⁷⁶ As Wilson states: "[Planoudes was not] the first among Palaiologan scholars nor the only one to undertake such an extraordinary endeavour, but was accompanied by senior contemporary Manuel Holobolos", who held the position as secretary to Emperor Michael Palaiologos and preceded Planoudes as the first to translate Latin literary works. The influence of these individuals is evident and it is clear they played "a significant role in the public life of Constantinople and in its intellectual circles".⁷⁷ The influence of Byzantine Humanists such as Manuel Chrysoloras and Plethon in the West is undeniable, and Barbour would

⁷³ Scholarios, 'Lamentation of Scholarios on the Misfortunes of his Life', [Lamentation de Scholarios sur les malheurs de sa vie (1460)], in *Œuvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 289; Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle,' vol.VII, 4; Alexander P. Kazhdan, 'George Pachymeres', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. Alexander Kazhdan, vol 3 (New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 1550.

⁷⁴ Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, 230-231; Elizabeth A.Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation'. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 43 (2002/3): 77-104; Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 701-3.

⁷⁵ Marcus Rautman, *Daily Life in The Byzantine Empire*. (Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press. 2006), 85,

⁷⁶ Scholarios, 'On Divine Grace,' [De la Grace Divine], in *Œuvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.II. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), 229; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 425; Donald MacGillivray Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261 -1453*: (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1993), 165.

⁷⁷ Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, 230; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation', 78.

be incorrect to overlook their influence. Such works that were translated included theological texts, and as such, these would not have been translated other than to be examined and studied.⁷⁸ Dimitrios Kydonis, who translated major works of Thomas Aquinas, was an ardent Thomist who was subsequently to convert to the Roman Church, and it is important to acknowledge his influential status.⁷⁹ We must therefore question Barbour's somewhat over-simplified characterisation of Byzantine society.⁸⁰ Barbour's selection of examples to support his argument about "Byzantine Thomism", such as Patriarchs Photios, credited as the cause of the Photian Schism over his disputable election, but also upholder of Orthodox jurisdiction and defender of the Proceedance of the Holy Spirit from the Father against the Filioque Clause,⁸¹ and John Xiphilinos, jurist and opponent to the pagan influence found in philosophy propounded

⁷⁸ Papaioannou, 'Michael Psellos, Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium', 53.

⁷⁹ Dimitrios Kydonis, 'According to the Blasphemous Dogma of Gregory Palamas and the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Περὶ τῶν βλασφημῶν δογμάτων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος], P.G.154, 835A-1216B. The section on attacking Gregory Palamas is from 835A-864B. The second section on the Procession of the Holy Spirit is from 865A-968B. See 836; Giovanni Mercati, 'Information of Procoros and Dimitrios Kydonis, Manuel Kalika and Theodore Militiniota', [Notizie Di Procoro E Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca E Teodoro Meliteniota, Ed Altri Appunti Per La Storia Della Teologia E Della Letteratura Bizantina Del Secolo XIV,] titled in Italian -Apologia della propria Fede (Defense of faith), in Greek of Kydonis original work, (Vatican City [Città del Vaticano]: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana 1931), 359-403. See the work titled in Greek -Τοῦ μακαρίτου κυριοῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνη, pages 362-363 are informative regarding Kydonis and his reason for the translation of Thomas Aquinas' works; Manuel Chrysoloras, 'Letter of Chrysoloras on the comparison of Old Rome and New Rome,' P.G.156, 23A-60B..

See biographical information about Chrysoloras and his assessment of Dimitrios Kydonis and Emperor Manuel II; Ernest Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium, from Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus*. Passages from Byzantine writers and Documents. Translation with an Introduction and Notes by Ernest Barker. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1957), 19; Stylianos G.Papadopoulos, *Orthodoxy and Scholastic Theology*, [Ορθόδοξη Καὶ Σχολαστική Θεολογία], in Greek, (Athens:[s.n.]), 21-23.

⁸⁰ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 33: In the footnote, num.89. Barbour presents the question of authenticity as to who originally translated the texts of Thomas Aquinas.

⁸¹ Cyril Mango, 'Revival of Learning,' in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. Cyril Mango (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1991), 214. See the homily of Patriarch Photios on the feast of the Annunciation on the subject solely begotten of the Father in reference to the Filioque Clause; Robert Hoyland, 'The Rise of Islam', in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. Cyril Mango (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1991), 121-122; Elizabeth Jeffreys and Cyril Mango, 'Towards a Franco-Greek Culture,' ed. Cyril Mango (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1991), 121-122; Cyril Mango, *Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies Three. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958), 302; Johan Meijer C.Ss.R. *A Successful Council of Union, A theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879-880*, (Thessaloniki: Analekta Vlatadon. Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1975), 181-188; Deno John Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization Seen through Contemporary Eyes*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press.1984), 205.

by Michael Psellos,⁸² who both had a preference for Aristotle, are too simplified. However, Barbour does make the point that certain sections of Byzantine society did undertake a rudimental study of the theological speculations of Thomas Aquinas, but this was a select group and not all of the Byzantine society.⁸³ What Barbour implies is that in the Byzantine Empire, intense philosophical and theological studies were neither pursued nor advanced extensively, but the alternative evidence conflicts with this view. One source of such evidence can be found in the works of Scholarios himself, and in Scholarios' discussions about Thomas Aquinas.

Barbour states that Scholarios never translated theological works of Thomas Aquinas, but this is contradicted by Livanos, who argues that Scholarios, prior to his third term as Patriarch, had translated Thomas Aquinas' two major masterpieces, the '*Summa contra gentiles*' and the '*Summa theologiae*': both are theological and philosophical works. Barbour asserts that the translation of '*De ente et essential*' was not Scholarios' work,

⁸² Michael Psellus, *Chronographia* [Χρονογραφία], in Greek, vol.1. (Athens: Agrostis Ekdoseis.1992) and vol 2. (Athens: Kanaki Ekdoseis. 1996). This is a biographical account of the lives of emperors in period of the eleventh century. It is informative since Psellos is recounting the rhetorical tradition and indicating how it will give impetus to future historians, including Pachymeres and Gregoras. See footnotes 59 and 60; Michael Psellus, *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*. (England: Penguin Books Ltd, 1966), 257; Michael Psellus, *Michael Psellos Panegyric Orations* [Michaelis Pselli orations panegyricae,] ed. G.T. Dennis: (Leipzig and Stuttgart, 1994), 98; Michael Psellos, *The Soul* [Δόξα Περὶ Ψυχῆς-De Anima,] P.G.122, 1029A-1076B; John Duffy, *Hellenic Philosophy in Byzantium and the Lonely Mission of Michael Psellos* ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou, *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2002), 139; Katerina Ierodiakonou, ed., 'Psellos' Paraphrasis on Aristotle's De interpretation', in *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2002), 157; Constantine Sathas, *The History of Psellus* (London: Collaboration J. B.Bury. Methuen and Co. 1899. Reprinted New York AMS Press.1979), 1-20, 217. This offers an historical account and description of the emperors as predetermine by the 'epideictic' canons of rhetorical discipline.; Demetrios Chomatenos, *Mandate for Ordained Metropolitan and Archbishop and others*, [Εντάλματα Διδόμενα Τοῖς Χειροτονουμένοις μητροπολίταις, καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόποις, καὶ ἐτέροις], P.G.119, 937A-959A, 1125A-1160B. See specifically 1132 titled *Ordained Metropolitan and Archbishop. Τῷ Χειροτονουμένῳ μητροπολίτῃ καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ* Demetrios Chomatenos (Δημήτριος τοῦ Χωματεῖανου). In this text rhetorical discipline is emphasised in the relation between the emperor and the law; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization*, 403; Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 26; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 52.

⁸³ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 38.

and claims that Scholarios plagiarised in his literary works⁸⁴. However, there are some key objections to these assertions.

Barbour's argument rests on the claim that the translation of Thomas Aquinas' '*Summa contra gentiles*' took place prior to Scholarios' third term as Patriarch in 1464, and that the library of the Harsianitis Monastery (officially known as St Mary Nea Peribleptos) contained this work. This is questionable.⁸⁵ Barbour also accredits the monastery as the major source through which Scholarios was introduced to, and greatly influenced by, the works of Thomas Aquinas, but avoids mentioning the monastery of Pantocrator where he remained for a considerable period. Nor are the Latin monasteries located in Pera cited, where the source of the philosophical and theological speculations of Aquinas would be propagated. Major Latin sources were not to be found in the Orthodox monasteries in Constantinople, but in the monasteries of the Latins that were located in the vicinity and confines of the City, a point of view that he avoids mentioning, although this is noted by Turner, and elsewhere in other recent research.⁸⁶

The assertion that the source of Latin learning must be the monastery of Harsianitis is not the only assumption made by Barbour, but he also makes assumptions about the individuals that were associated with this monastery of Harsianitis. Two individuals

⁸⁴ Ibid. 57.

⁸⁵ Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou, 'Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch: new evidence on Gennadios Scholarios Responses to the Questions of George Brankovic', in *The historical Review/La Revue Historique*, Department of Neohellenic Research/Institute of Historical Research 9 (2012), 95-116. See Machi Paizi-Apostolopoulou on her work of correspondence between Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios and the Serbian Despot Brankovic after the year of 1453 from 1454-1456. It is intuitive since it articulates and questions the survival of Byzantine manuscripts after the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks. The City of Constantinople was under the Ottoman rule, which would stipulate the monasteries and its libraries were in ruins and thus there were no resources to obtain such works. However, further research will be needed to verify this opinion.

⁸⁶ Scholarios, 'Justification Discours of Scholarios accused of Latinism' vol.I. 381; Scholarios, 'To the Emperor Constantine' [A l'empereur Constantin], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 463; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation', 95-96.

associated with this monastery and who subsequently had a major influence on Scholarios were Makarios Makres and Joseph Bryennios.⁸⁷ Barbour accredits them as being the source of what he terms the “lineage” by which Scholarios had been influenced in Latin learning.⁸⁸ He thus redirects attention to the monastery that was in the forefront of propagating the Palamite Tradition and was known to be anti-Unionist, to make this the influential source of Latin learning, and hence directs attention away from the Latin monasteries that Scholarios was communicating with in his dialogue and correspondence with the Pope.⁸⁹ In fact the example of the anti-Union and anti-Latin Holobolos in the fourteenth century, who came into contact with Latin scholars and was eventually influenced by them, only demonstrates the influence that was exerted by the Latin monasteries in Pera, and cannot be presumed to extend to any other establishment.⁹⁰ Other than mentioning the Latin presences in their exclusive domain and the Latin monasteries to be found in Constantinople, both Makarios Makres and Joseph Bryennios were ardent anti-Latins and subsequently anti-Unionist. This would certainly not put them in the circle from which Latin learning would be propagated, but rather in the strongly Orthodox point of view and certainly Hesychasts.

Barbour does mention that these two individuals were not Latin sympathizers. However, generally, those who had any association with the Latins in the City would have to have searched to find a common factor between the two Churches, and they did not perceive the intricacies of Aquinas’ philosophical, let alone theological, speculations to be an obstacle. Furthermore, they would be Latinophrones or Latinophiles, which these two

⁸⁷ Nikolaos B. Tomadaki, *Joseph Bryennios and Crete around the 1400s*. (Athens: Bibliopoleiou E.G. Bagionaki. 1947), 12; Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 44.

⁸⁸ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 42–43.

⁸⁹ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV’, [Au pape Eugène IV], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 432.

⁹⁰ Fisher, ‘Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation’, 95.

individuals were not. There is an omission in not recognising the imperial administration and court as an avenue of Latin influence, which projected a strong interest in Latin learning.⁹¹ Livanos accredits Barbour with valuable insight in the research of Scholarios, but emphasizes he feels Barbour was erroneous in his conclusions.⁹²

Hugh Barbour and Christopher Livanos both address not only the ultimate change in Scholarios, but also open up inquiries into the anthropological and theological spheres, primarily the knowledge that Scholarios had of Aquinas' theology and unrecognised doctrinal divisions. Scholarly studies normally draw their criteria from either philosophical or theological resources and not from political events that govern the procedure of these endeavours; however, as I have argued, it is essential to take a broader view of the context and influences if we are to gain as full an understanding as possible of Scholarios in this study. Rather than solving the problem of why Scholarios' position changed, various authors have extended the complexity and division, attributing the change to doctrine or to philosophical terminologies.

Barbour and Livanos do not simply address the problem of what motivated the change in Scholarios, but rather analyse the various avenues of influences of anthropological and etymological terminologies within the theological, philosophical sphere, as they are reflected in Scholarios' works. Livanos suggests that the recognition of Scholarios' contribution is universal but he also implies that he remains an under-studied person.⁹³

Therefore, Livanos's study incorporates a wider scope of anthropological and

⁹¹ Scholarios, 'Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Epheses', vol.IV. 117; Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios* 38; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism* 25. See at the bottom of the page, Siniossoglou gives an enhanced encapsulation of the Byzantines attraction towards Thomas Aquinas; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424-425.

⁹² Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21.

⁹³ Ibid. 19.

etymological subjects. He does this not as one particular narrow aspect of the study but introduces the subjects within the scope of culture and history in an inclusive examination of all the factors that might possibly have had an influence on Scholarios. It is a field of study that does allow one to examine the reasons for the psychological makeup of Scholarios, through the various influences that would have affected him, and ultimately brought him to the conclusions for his choice; firstly motivating Scholarios towards pro-Union and then ultimately changing his opinion to the opposite camp of anti-Union.

Livanos presents some clarification of the crucial topics that divided the churches: the Filioque Clause, Purgatory and Primacy of the Pope. He presents the elements of division and the points of interest that engendered various aspects of differences of opinion, and discusses the etymological and cultural implications. This work offers new insights into some key political motivations that are not examined or presented explicitly by others. The idea that Scholarios was open to various influences in philosophy and theology is supported by Turner, as stated in his article, '*The Career of George–Gennadios Scholarios*,' where he argues Scholarios was well acquainted with the theological speculations of Augustine, Duns Scotus and also Peter Lombard, which would reflect various key philosophical terminologies that were articulated in and through these theological speculations.⁹⁴

In Livanos's Introduction, two sub-headings are introduced. The first is '*Cultural Animosity*' and the second is '*Anthropology and Official Dogma*.' Under the first heading, a brief explanation of the animosity is stated, reflecting the words of Niketas

⁹⁴ Scholarios, 'Introduction' in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), xxxvii; Scholarios, 'Divine Predestination' [Περὶ θείου προορισμοῦ] [De la Prédestination divine], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 423; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 425.

Choniates to the effect that the divisions that existed between the two entities of East and West were cultural differences.⁹⁵ As Livanos notes, the notion of Original Sin and inherited guilt by man was the crucial theological basis that separated the two fundamental understandings by East and West; the failure to understand was due to the radically different concepts of anthropology that each held in the context of theology. Hence, the concepts of theological dogmas are developed from different cultural and theological premises, resulting in misconceptions each held of the other precisely in the field of discussion in which they were trying to solve their differences.

Byzantine scholars affirm Scholarios was influenced not only by the theological speculations of Thomas Aquinas but also of Augustine, Dun Scotus and the Eastern Church Fathers.⁹⁶ If this proposition is correct, we might assume the catalyst for his change of position would be theology alone, and as such would be the main topic of discussion. But, I will argue, this viewpoint is imperfect and incomplete. I will go on to explain how theology was articulated by philosophical terminologies and at least some of the the impetus or driving force behind these two subjects, philosophy and theology, was designated by the imperial political policies and ideologies.⁹⁷

Even though there is some truth in this view, nevertheless there is some further detail and delineation required. Theological diversities were not in fact acknowledged to be the main reason for the division between the two, East and West, but rather the military, economic interests that motivated the division were held responsible, and were

⁹⁵ Niketas Choniates, *Niketas Choniates History [Nicetae Choniatae Historiae]*, ed. Jan-Louis Van Dieten Fontiam Historiae Byzantium, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 27-28; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 3-4.

⁹⁶ Scholarios, 'Divine Predestination' vol.I.423; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence* 10.

⁹⁷ Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, See the beginning reason to the political problems initiated by Emperor Michael Palaiologos, 27 ; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 41 ; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 377.

considered the cause for the theological division.⁹⁸ Livanos, Zisis and Barbour formulate their work in such a way as to emphasise etymological and theological differences, and they render these topics as the main obstacle between East and West. The failure to delineate the historical and political issues as a cause of division between East and West suggests an incomplete analysis of the topic of the dissonant state. One major cause of misunderstanding in this area of study is the ways in which vested political interests manipulate debates for their own ends; and thus theology was used as a tool to accentuate the differences for specific interests. The use of the word anthropology by Livanos must therefore be interpreted and understood in this context, and, I would suggest reflects the political implications of Scholarios' works.⁹⁹

Under the heading '*Anthropology and Official Dogma*', Livanos discusses the divisional adherence to various influential strands of Western speculative theology by Scholarios. He references Scholarios' work, volume 1:501, suggesting that Scholarios echoes an Augustinian concept of Original Sin and then goes beyond this by advocating Scotus's doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.¹⁰⁰ Livanos presents Scholarios' belief in the Immaculate Conception as an example and points out that, as this dogma was not found in nor endorsed by Thomas Aquinas (or the Roman Church at this point in time), but was contradicted by him; this demonstrates that Scholarios maintained various theological speculative traditions rather than adopting a total adherence to Aquinas' theology.

⁹⁸ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 13, 50.

⁹⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 3–5.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 4.

The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception was, as Livanos points out, promoted primarily by Dun Scotus in his speculative theology.¹⁰¹ However, the argument does not rest here as a prime example of Western theological influence on Scholarios, but as the basis in the concept of Immaculate Conception which is appropriated from the Augustinian argument of Original Sin.¹⁰² It emphasizes the diversity of Scholarios' theological perceptions, rather than any precise theological tradition.¹⁰³ Livanos suggests that Scholarios' variance in both Latin and Greek speculative theology was motivated by political necessities. It is not surprising, then that the term used by Livanos to describe Scholarios' actions by employing the word 'dissonant', is not used by him alone, but also by Jugie, Turner, Zisis and Barbour. Even though it appears to be used in partial affirmation, it also appears to imply a political dimension to such diversity of influences.¹⁰⁴

The Scholastic method of dissonant opinions is reflected in Scholarios' presentation of philosophical/theological themes, which, as Livanos states, is the divisional acknowledgement of various influences of both Latin and Greek speculative theology, adhered to by Scholarios. However, what is noteworthy is the process of projecting an

¹⁰¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 9-10, 20; Frederick Copleston, S.J. 'Augustine to Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas to Duns Scotus', in *A History of Philosophy*, vol. 2. Mediaeval Philosophy, Part 1 and 2.(Garden City, New York: Image Books, Double Day & Co. 1962),55-116,269-566.

¹⁰² Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol 5. Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture since 1700 (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1989), 278–280.The Augustinian argument of Original Sin affirms the dogma of the Immaculate Conception stipulates that the Theotokos was born without the inherited guilt of Adam, thus exonerating her of any association to Original Sin.

¹⁰³ Josef Pieper, *Guide to Thomas Aquinas*.Translated from German by Richard and Clara Winston. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 52-54.

¹⁰⁴ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.III. xxxvii; Scholarios, 'The second trait on the Procession of the Holy Spirit' [Deuxième Traité sur La Procession du Saint-Esprit], vol.II. 44, 440. Jugie states that Scholarios was well acquainted with Augustine and Dun Scotus, but also notes the divisional aspect of Scholarios reflected in theology.

ideology, the process of imperial rhetorical propaganda, through philosophical and theological thought.¹⁰⁵

It was the method by which Scholarios utilised an argument to accentuate the message. The adaptation of Aristotelian rhetorical process, together with the scholastic method deploying skills of articulation and the power of speech and literature, could be used to promote specific political aspirations; hence, the method of presentation would be consistent with the promotion of political thought and writings. This suggestion is advanced and supported by Angelov in his discussion of imperial ideology, and by Siniossoglou in his argument about the application of Platonism as a political tool or implement.¹⁰⁶

The failure of East and West to understand their anthropological differences, as Livanos states, was not the only criterion that separated the two. Plethon and Scholarios also differed in how they envisaged the future of Byzantine society, as we will see in Chapter Five.¹⁰⁷

Scholarios' increasing apologetics and his attempts to preserve cultural monuments, implying the preservation of the Orthodox Faith and the continuity of the Byzantine Society, reinforces enforces the political implications of the above statement. Even though Livanos emphasizes that Scholarios sought the preservation of the Hellenic

¹⁰⁵ Choniates, *Niketas Choniates History*, 27-28; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 64, 203; Mango, 'The Revival of Learning', 217.

¹⁰⁶ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 15; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 327.

¹⁰⁷ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon' vol.IV.2. In the section '*The Conflict with Plethon*,' Livanos introduces the theme reflecting Siniossoglou's argument presented in his book as stated above, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, not articulating the cultural and theological differences between East and West but Platonism as force of influence in the Byzantine society. See, Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 11, 93; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence* 71; Vojtěch Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*. Platonism in the Late Byzantium, between Hellenism and Orthodoxy. (England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1988), 243.

culture, the term might be misconstrued to define Byzantine society according to secular tendencies, and that further, this was being sought by Scholarios. 'For the term Hellenic culture is endemic with the term secular tendency which was immediately recognised as the most serious threat to Orthodoxy'.¹⁰⁸ It is encapsulated in Scholarios' words, which are noted by Siniossoglou. '...in our times', he says, 'it is dangerous to experiment with the discovery of new things. Instead, one should focus on preserving the 'ancestral' tradition of the Fathers of the Church. However he sought to forge these two crucial elements in the new identity'.¹⁰⁹

Livanos presents an interesting view, but one that needs to be examined more closely, since it reflects ideologies that are galvanised and promoted in today's society in both Greek and secular societies. An issue that arises with Livanos' view, Markos Gkiolas argues, is whether Livanos is transplanting an ideology back onto the past, but one that is based on today's society, and giving credence for its conception directly to Plethon and Scholarios. It seems that Livanos is speaking to today's society, pointing out the failures that were committed in the past so as to rectify the division that still exists between East and West.¹¹⁰

A comprehensive examination of how Plethon envisaged the future of Byzantine society is crucial; especially the question of how Scholarios reacted to Plethon's vision. This point was noted previously by C.M. Woodhouse's work, in his research on Plethon, particularly in terms of his relationship with Scholarios.¹¹¹ It suggests that the reason for Scholarios' change in view was his political perception as a whole for the future of the

¹⁰⁸ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 71; George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* Translated by J. Sibree, (New York: Dover Publications, 1956), 343-411; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 99.

¹⁰⁹ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 112.

¹¹⁰ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 72-3.

¹¹¹ C.M. Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon, The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1986), 283.

Byzantine Empire. Plethon's vision, as Livanos states, was completely unrealistic; 'he sought far-reaching social and political reforms based on the Plato's Republic and Laws'.¹¹²

The recent published work on Gemistos Plethon by Niketas Siniossoglou, entitled *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, emphasizes Plethon's radical visionary concept for the future of the Byzantine State. However, it also articulates Scholarios' political vision for the State and thus the reason for his opposition to Plethon.¹¹³ Scholarios' future vision of the state emerges from a political context that governs Scholarios' whole outlook, and, I will argue, must be seen as such. The main thrust of the division between East and West is, as has been stated, was motivated by political forces. Too often philosophical/theological divisions are emphasized as being the primary reason for the division. On the contrary, I suggest the division has its roots in the cultural differences and political interests that motivated East and West.¹¹⁴

Scholarios' works demonstrate how much he inherited influence or tradition, and that he had no qualms about addressing the arguments of various Eastern patristic fathers in order to articulate a point of view—theologically or politically, so as to bring about political conformity of opinion between the East, that is Byzantine, the Latin West, and the Ottoman Turks. Scholarios was motivated by political interests, which were the criteria used to formulate alternative theological opinions. To exonerate Scholarios of all pro-Union sympathies by extracting all pro-Union opinion from his texts so as to

¹¹² Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 93; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 125. See the chapter dedicated to the reason for Scholarios' and Plethon's mutual antagonism on the topic of the political view for the future of the Byzantine Empire.

¹¹³ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 11.

¹¹⁴ George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 341; Steven Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople 1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 19; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 339; Steven Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his reign, A Study of tenth Century Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), 120.

achieve an image of Orthodox correctness amounts to a serious distortion. Livanos clearly states about Barbour: “While Barbour is correct that Scholarios’ Thomism was mainly philosophical rather than theological, he sometimes overstates his case. Barbour exaggerates ...”¹¹⁵ or perhaps he was confusing Scholarios with Kydonis, for this was the case; Kydonis accentuates philosophical themes within Aquinas’ work.¹¹⁶

Having presented the above sources of research as crucial to the context of my study of Scholarios, another source of recent research to be taken into consideration is that of Marie-Hélène Blanchet's work, entitled ‘*Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (1400- vers 1472) An Orthodox Intellectual in the confrontation of the Desperation of the Byzantine Empire.*’¹¹⁷ Blanchet offers an enlightening account particularly in the examination of Scholarios’ correspondence with the Western political powers and the Papal state. The work suggests that Scholarios’ main interests were politically motivated, which would connote Scholarios prime endeavour and cannot to be exclusively associated with studies in the domain of philosophy or theology, and I will follow this argument and expand upon it in this thesis. Scholarios was truly an enigmatic person, accepting and employing various traditions that he thought would aid the imperial state. This was not solely in the attempt to obtain military aid; he also sought to revitalise and replenish the Byzantine Empire following her former loss. Further research will demonstrate that Scholarios was not only motivated by an interest in promoting cultural diversity but also changing the political terrain.

¹¹⁵ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 23.

¹¹⁶ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones* 54–93; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius’, 426, see footnote 3.

¹¹⁷ Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (circa 1400- 1472) an intellectual Orthodox facing the Demise of the Byzantine Empire*, [*Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472) un intellectuel Orthodoxe face à la Disparition de L'Empire Byzantin*], (Paris: Institut Français D’Études Byzantines, 2008).

CHAPTER TWO - RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODOLOGY - INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL QUESTION TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE THESIS

In Chapter Two, I will outline the scope of this thesis, discussing the crucial questions that need to be addressed, and the method I will use to develop my arguments.

This thesis is endeavouring to establish the reason why Scholarios altered his opinion to anti-Union. Even though there has been extensive research on Scholarios, the issue of his change has always remained an enigma. While attending the Council of Florence in 1438–9, in the endeavour to bring about the Union of the Eastern and Western churches, Scholarios was wholeheartedly for the Union. Within five years, his pro-Union stance presented at the Council of Florence would change; in fact, the altered state was so dramatic that Scholarios had not only changed his opinion of Union but had accepted the leadership of the anti-Union faction. The question addressed here is why, within a few years of the Council of Florence at which the Union of the churches had been decided upon, Scholarios' position changed drastically from pro-Union to anti-Union.

In the year 1450, George Scholarios took the name of Gennadios, having become a monk, first in the Monastery of Pantocrator, then due to the laxity of monastic observance of the monastery (that is: its viewpoint on Union) he transferred to the Monastery of Harsianitis. Scholars in this field of studies indicate that the Monastery of Harsianitis was strongly opposed to the influence of the Latins or

Latinophrones/Latinophile Byzantines in Constantinople and was anti-Unionist.¹¹⁸ I suggest the transfer was not an arbitrary decision on the part of Scholarios, but had its roots in the political situation that the City of Constantinople was enduring at that stage.

These political ramifications were realised when, following the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks, Scholarios was specifically chosen by the conqueror of this city, Sultan Mehmed II, to become the Patriarch of the See of Constantinople that had become vacant a few years prior to the fall. This appointment again draws us back to reflect on the political implications of Scholarios' pursuit of his course of study in his early period, and the theological treatises in the later part of his life.¹¹⁹ The link between Scholarios' studies and his selection as Patriarch is crucial, for it suggests a political motivation for his changed state of opinion on Union.¹²⁰

In his early correspondence, Scholarios wrote on the necessity of the Union of the Churches insofar as the Union would initiate military aid for the City of Constantinople, and the benefits that aid would bring not only to the Byzantines, but also to the Latins. Scholarios undergoes a major shift in opinion in his correspondence after the Council of Florence in 1439, where he writes of his changing attitude in his approach to Union; even though he still advocates adherence to the Union, he is beginning to modify his views.

¹¹⁸ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 439; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 248.

¹¹⁹ The two statements that have been introduced in the above in the implication of the pursuit of the topics of studies are not chosen arbitrarily. Nor, as has been implied elsewhere, can Scholarios' selection by the Sultan to be the first patriarch under the authority of the newly established power of the Ottomans be coincidental, considering Scholarios' anti-union stance. There is a certain political undertone to this appointment of Scholarios as patriarch.

¹²⁰ Scholarios, 'Scholarios Pastoral Letter after the Capture of Constantinople', vol.IV.228-229,265; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 392.

Scholarios did not openly advocate the anti-Union stance until 1444–5, which suggests something important was causing him to be tentative about advocating any opinion on this issue for six years. My hypothesis is that this tentativeness was caused by the specific political events at this time, which led to Scholarios' reluctance to openly voice any declaration of anti-Union sentiments.

If Scholarios was motivated by the political situation that was transpiring in Constantinople, then presumably he was not primarily motivated by any simple admiration for philosophy, nor theology. Rather, he was motivated by what could be achieved by the study of these disciplines in the dialogue with the Latins, so as to obtain the necessary aid the Byzantine State required, which would also entail direct political negotiations and communications with the Ottoman Turks.

Sources to be examined

In this thesis, I will focus on the association of the official imperial propaganda with the philosophical and theological subjects that Scholarios was to pursue, and the reason why it fostered the study of these subjects. The premise of the motive for studying Aristotelian philosophy will be examined, such as the application of the rhetorical models of '*Aristotle's Rhetoric*'. Did this initial source motivate Scholarios to deliberate upon the official imperial image? If so, was the philosophical influence the prime motivator for the interest in the theological debates, that is, the theological speculations of Aquinas and the problem of the Filioque Clause that Scholarios was later to constantly articulate, especially on the dogmas that divided the Eastern and Roman churches?

Dimiter Angelov's book, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330* analyses imperial political propaganda during the Laskaris and early Palaiologan Dynasties, a hundred or so years prior to Scholarios. Angelov's approach examines the different sources for the polemics, and debates between individuals, that can be found in their respective imperial panegyric and rhetorical works of the period.

Angelov's introduction to his research argues that panegyric and rhetoric works of the period were products of political propaganda, and as such reflect individuals in the service of the state and also in the church, which transmitted elements of official ideology to their recipients.¹²¹ Byzantine preambles introduced general imperial legislation and, most importantly, made ideological pronouncements about the duties and status of imperial authority.

I will argue that the recent research on the subject of imperial propaganda in the period of Theodore Laskaris and the early Palaiologan era emphasises the impact of imperial propaganda. I will follow the methodology of the approach to the investigation of panegyric and rhetoric works of that period, which, I will argue, had a decisive influence on Scholarios' works and his subsequent political aspirations.

I will argue the study of Scholarios' reason for being pro-Union and his subsequent change of opinion to anti-Union should commence from his initial political cognizance of the issues in question, primarily from his early years in the service of the imperial bureaucracy. This is reflected in his correspondence with Western and Papal powers and hence demonstrates that Scholarios' works in both philosophy and theology do follow the model that Angelov presents in his work on imperial propaganda:

¹²¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 15, 200.

- a) the study of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as model was deployed by those in service to the state to help present the official image of the state authority
- b) panegyric works and homilies were articulated to project the state imperial image
- c) and these works were to used to argue constructively with their political adversaries.

The Subject of Rhetoric

In Chapter Three, I will examine the key cultural role that Aristotelian philosophy played in the fifteenth century, and the extent to which Scholarios' views were formed and shaped by this philosophical context. I will suggest that the imperial approach to political propaganda was the preliminary source for this philosophical interest, which promoted such study to aid their response when engaging in dialectic reasoning with their political rivals. I will argue that interpretations of polemics, debates, panegyrics and rhetoric of the period were in fact products of political propaganda, and 'conveyed elements of official ideology to their recipients'.

Byzantine policy introduced general imperial legislation and, most importantly, made ideological pronouncements about the duties and status of imperial authority. Imperial ideology deliberately outlined political reasons for studying philosophy. Another major influence was Dimitrios Kydonis, with his translations of the major philosophical and theological works of Thomas Aquinas. This chapter will argue that these philosophical influences provided the initial motivation that moved Scholarios towards Union. Additionally, if this was the case, I will examine whether this philosophical influence was the prime motivator of the interest in the theological questions that Scholarios was

to consider later—especially concerning the dogmas that divided the Eastern and Roman churches—and the reason it was necessary to try to achieve the Union between the churches of Rome and Constantinople.

The implication of such political guidance warrants further investigation; therefore, I will continue by examining Scholarios' writings, not only on philosophy, but also on theology. I will explore whether the political guidance offered in the study of philosophy was also to be discerned in the study of theology.

In Chapter Three I suggest that an investigation of the above cannot be completed without knowing what scholars have said about Scholarios in their investigations and research on him; thus, a brief explanation is required to emphasise the major points of interest about Scholarios. An examination of correspondence, preambles and rhetoric that Scholarios emphasizes in his work will, I suggest, highlight the presence of elements of political ideology, and as such suggest a new direction in comprehending Scholarios' attitude to Union, the main question to be addressed in my thesis.

In his works, Scholarios states the various reasons he commenced studies of philosophy and the use of instruction through philosophical logic, which he found weak in Constantinople.¹²² What Scholarios considered weak in Constantinople was the inability of the Byzantines to hold any discussions with the Latins on the subject of

¹²² Scholarios, 'Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus', vol.IV. 117, 25–30; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To his Students', [Lettres signées-A ses élèves], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 403–406.

philosophy or theology, in order to bring about changes of opinion for political reasons.¹²³

These disciplines were primarily centred on two subjects: Aristotelianism, and the theological speculations of Thomas Aquinas, which had gained prime theological importance in the Roman Church in the past century. This also reflects the political situation at the time, for it was instrumental in assisting the political dominance of the Latins that prevailed in Constantinople. Since rhetoric is the stratagem and study of the use of language for persuasive cause, then Aristotle's systematization of rhetoric in the use of dialectic and discourse was to execute the presentation of arguments to better effect, as this was a vital element in influencing politics. Scholarios' emphasis on Aristotelian philosophy and rhetoric does not reflect an interest solely in philosophy, but the investigation of politics as belonging to the discipline of philosophy, which, in the case of Aristotle, re-emphasises the point that the two branches of philosophy, the theoretical and practical, co-exist in the sphere of the practical, comprising ethics, economics and politics.

I have suggested that Scholarios' study of Aristotelian philosophy was politically driven, and research in this field will demonstrate the initial reason for this interest. If philosophy or Aristotelian logic was utilized to project imperial power and propaganda, then we can see how the political policies of the Byzantine imperial authority were deliberately directed towards foreign powers. Thus, the points of view that Scholarios

¹²³ Scholarios, 'Scholarios Pastoral Letter after the Capture of Constantinople', vol.IV. 223, 226,266. Looking at the political problem with the Sultan after the demise of Constantinople, we can discern Scholarios' political and religious sphere of influence.

constantly refers to in his ongoing study of Aristotelian physics and metaphysics, and from which he copies extracts¹²⁴, reflect this political interest.¹²⁵

The use of rhetoric in panegyric and preambles further works, both in honour of the State, that is, as a representation of the Emperor, but also to accentuate the ecclesiastical interests. Scholarios' studies in Aristotelian philosophy emphasise that the method of rhetorical studies should adhere to this system of persuasive discourse. Rhetoric was studied to emphasise verbal projection of a political or theological ideology. The study of rhetoric was undertaken so as to be able to convince the opposition about what was presented in rebuttal, and as previously stated, Scholarios found this grasp of rhetoric was weak in Byzantine society at the time.

Scholarios' works aspire to replicate the rhetorical tradition and were instrumental in presenting imperial propaganda. Rhetoric was utilized as a dominant force of persuasion in the constant battle of presentation of dogma, especially as seen in at the Council of Florence, in their respective rebuttals with the Latins and the pro-Union Greeks.

My research will investigate the cause of Scholarios' change, by examining the reasons for his study of philosophy and what this study implies about his overall objectives. For this purpose, I will be looking not only at the panegyric preambles and those that were

¹²⁴ Scholarios, 'Philosophical Works', vol.VIII 505.

¹²⁵ Scholarios, 'On the Second Coming of the Lord and the Resurrection of the Body', [Sur le second avènement du Seigneur et la resurrection des corps], in *Œuvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 331-343 ; Scholarios, 'On the distinction of persons divine (1464)', [Sur la distinction des personnes divines(1464)], in *Œuvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 430-433. The two footnotes are examples of Scholarios political agenda,even though they are of theological subject, having been written in the period after the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, directs it towards to whom, the intended articles were written for; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 8–9. Angelov suggests Scholarios'enthronement as patriarch is governed by the political and economic factors that interested the Sultan.

mentioned above in the polemic works, but most importantly on Scholarios' correspondence that Louis Petit, Xenophon Siderides and Martin Jugie call '*The Complete Works of Gennadios Scholarios*'.¹²⁶

However, the investigation will be centred primarily on Scholarios' correspondence that emphasizes his pro-Union policies before the Council of Florence of 1438–1439. Another avenue of investigation will be the '*Memoires of Sylvester Syropoulos*', one of the archdeacons who attended the Council of Florence and wrote extensively on the political machinations between the Latins and Greeks attending the Council, including George Scholarios.

As well as the above sources, I will also examine political historical documentation prior to, and post, the Fall of Constantinople that reflect Scholarios' motion for pro-Union. I will suggest that the gradual change in Scholarios was not motivated solely by theological conviction, but reflected the political dictates that governed the change.¹²⁷ Scholarios did not enter into the study of Aristotelian philosophy without a purpose. The study was a calculated choice to address the growing problem of the influence of the Ottoman Turks. So too, his studies in the Western theological speculations of Augustine and Aquinas were entered into for the same purpose, not only to address the Latins and their theological demands in the assertions they were making against the Byzantine Greeks, but also to aid the Byzantines in their rapport with the Ottoman Turks.

¹²⁶ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the Emperor Constantine', vol.IV.463; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 438. The name of Gennadios is the monastic appellation of George Scholarios after the year 1450, when he officially entered the monastic life and was tonsured a monk.

¹²⁷ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 16. Marie Blanchet had some problems with the early correspondence, as even though it is edited, there is the absence of any translation, and it remains unclear and relies mainly on the autobiographical texts.

The Subject of Theology

In Chapter Four, I will examine how Aristotelian philosophy was deployed as an explanatory tool in interpretations of polemics, debates, and panegyric and rhetoric works of the period. I will suggest that Byzantine preambles, poems, sermons and theological panegyrics were also subject to general imperial legislation and, most importantly, made ideological pronouncements deliberately setting out the political motivation for studying theology.¹²⁸ I will go on to assert that Aristotelian philosophy, deploying as it does the method of rhetorical classification which is advanced by Thomas Aquinas in his theological writings, can also explain why Scholarios was introduced to the study of this particular philosophy and his subsequent ardent interest in the theological speculations of Aquinas.

However, the issue of political dialogue did not only govern Byzantine dialogue with the Latins but also featured in dialectic reasoning with the Ottoman Turks. I will argue the translation of Aquinas' work *Summae* by Kydonis and Scholarios, had political motives, and since the theological work of the *Summae* were dialectic apologia for the Christian faith in response to the Mohammedans. I will argue Scholarios imitated Dimitrios Kydonis by following the political directives of his work in the endeavour to engage in political dialogue with the Mohammedans.

There is also a third element of political confrontation which was a domestic problem, and this is to be found in correspondence directly addressed to Gemistos Plethon. I will argue that all of Scholarios' works were purposely engaged in rebuttals in either domestic or foreign affairs affecting the Byzantines.

¹²⁸ Gill Page, *Being Byzantine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008), 196.

Governing the research on the studies of rhetoric is the claim that Scholarios' theological perspective remained in admiration of Thomas Aquinas, even after rejecting the Union that was officially proclaimed at the Council of Florence in 1439. This demonstrates Scholarios was lenient and open-minded on this topic of theology, especially when certain key concepts in theology, which were advocated by him, were not adhered to by the Orthodox Church. It is further suggested that, through this example of his broad-based approach to theology, the diversity of Scholarios' opinions did not rest here alone, but could be extended to other fields that Scholarios was endeavouring to propagate due to political necessities. It brings into question whether Scholarios' theological convictions were motivated out of sincere Orthodox theological conviction or from political necessities. This study considers whether the intricate ideological and politico-religious dimensions of his work really do reflect Scholarios' basic motivations.¹²⁹

As has been noted by other sources in this field of study, Scholarios' introduction to the theological works of Thomas Aquinas began with his enquiries into Aristotle's works on metaphysics, logics and physics, and subsequently this enquiry was to lead Scholarios to further research in the realm of the theological newcomer, Thomas Aquinas.

Even though Scholarios rejects the prime premise of the Filioque Clause that Thomas Aquinas presents, his acceptance of key elements of Augustine, Dun Scotus and Thomas Aquinas' thinking is evident in his attempt to find a conciliatory formula at the Council of Florence that would be acceptable to both parties in the theological divergence between the Eastern and Roman churches.

¹²⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters (before the end of the year 1450) [avant la fin de l'année 1450]', vol.IV.399; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 13.

Scholarios' ability to assimilate the various irreconcilable theological concepts of individuals from sources of the Eastern and Roman Church suggests that doctrinal concepts were capable of being adapted; this would indicate that Scholarios was not conservative in theological orthodoxy but adapted willingly to theological insights from sources otherwise unfamiliar to Orthodoxy. I will follow this claim by suggesting that the theological works of Scholarios, primarily from year 1444, were usually of a political nature, not only in addressing the dogmatic differences between the Latin and Byzantines churches, but also in confronting the Ottoman Turks.

The Subject of Politics

In Chapter Five, I will argue Scholarios' study of Aristotelian philosophy had a political motive, allowing him to form a perception of how the political future of the Byzantine Empire was to be developed. I will further assert that Scholarios' ideas of reform were visionary, especially in regards to his perception of the Empire.

The prime examples of this vein of investigation of Aristotelian philosophy and the speculative theology of Aquinas and Augustine that was fostered by Scholarios—and that he reflected in his correspondence on theological treatises, and the secular and ecclesiastical preambles of the period—will be examined in relationship to the foreign policies conducted by the Byzantines in their relations with the Latins and Ottoman Turks. One key element in considering the issue of the political motivations of his thinking is Scholarios' attitude to the Imperial State and his perceived future view for it.

I will investigate Plethon's works, the two Memoranda, '*De Differentiis*', which reflect his political perspective of the future of the Byzantine Empire and his proposed plan to

radically change the political structure of the Empire; this was additionally apparent in his later work *'On the Laws'*. The ideological and politico-religious dimensions are discussed by Siniossoglou, including the question of Scholarios' fundamental motivations, the reasons for the acrimonious relationship between Scholarios and Plethon, and their differences of opinion as to how they perceived the future of the Byzantine Empire.¹³⁰ This is not merely circumstantial but does indicate the background context of Scholarios' developing political disposition. The rancorous exchanges in the correspondence between Scholarios and Plethon draw attention to the fierce political enmity that existed between them about the future political possibilities of the Empire and the welfare of the Byzantine imperial state.

If, as I claim, the contentious differences were fundamentally political issues, we can see why Plethon's vision of a political future state would be in total contrast to Scholarios' concept of the future of the state. The 'visionary reformer', as Siniossoglou writes of Plethon, is busy writing about how the future of the Byzantine Empire should be emerging. This suggests that if both Plethon and Scholarios had visionary concepts of the future of the Byzantine Empire, then Scholarios was already aware of the terms of this debate and was thinking in political terms.

I will be presenting and discussing various arguments, including Plethon's *Two Memorandas*¹³¹ together with the secondary sources of the work of C.M. Woodhouse, Niketas Siniossoglou, Vojtěch Hladký, and in his recent research on Plethon, Darien C. De Bolt's summary paper, together with various other discussions, as evidence of the

¹³⁰ George Gemistos Plethon, 'To the Emperor Manuel: According to the Reality of Peloponnese', in *Patrologiae cursus Completus*, P.G.160, 821A-840B. See the annotation of Plethon affirming the continuous presences of the Hellenes in the Peloponnese; George Gemistos Plethon, 'To the Despot Theodore, According to the Reality of Peloponnese,' P.G.160, 841A-866B; Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 270; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 13.

¹³¹ Plethon, 'To the Emperor Manuel, According to the Reality of Peloponnese', 822-840.

political-religious dimensions mentioned above.¹³² I have already referred above to Livanos's commentaries and also to Marie-Hélène Blanchet's work on Scholarios in the projecting of Scholarios' politico-ideology.

In Chapter Six, I argue that the primary key to comprehending the relationship between East and West lies in understanding the vested commercial interests. I argue the Byzantine state (commonly identified with this appellation rather than 'the Eastern Roman Empire') had deteriorated due to foreign powers (the Italian city states, Catalonians, Franks and the Ottoman Turks) attempting to acquire and dominate the commercial and strategic political domains of the Byzantine Empire. This was initially driven by trade and commercial rivalry between the Latins; commercial interests also prompted the development of naval and military power by the Latins at the expense of the Byzantine Empire, which eventually left it militarily and financially destitute. One result of this deterioration in the commercial and military power of the Empire was to allow the progressive rise in dominance of the Ottoman Turks. In light of the dangerous situation the Empire was facing, Scholarios—in the service of the imperial bureaucracy and under the dominance of the Emperor's political policy—sought to solve the dilemma and reconstruct the Empire's political power.

In relation to the arguments presented above, I will explain the relationship between Byzantine and Latin worlds, and the consequences of this relationship for Scholarios. Researchers in this area have emphasized the division between the cultural and political entities that were nonetheless interacting with one another. However, the division in culture was not the main contention, but rather the political interests and agendas that

¹³² Darien C. De Bolt, 'George Gemistos Plethon on God: Heterodoxy in Defence of Orthodoxy', *Summary paper given at the University of Oklahoma*. (Norman Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma 2006).

were being propagated by the various cultural and political groups in the fields of commerce and armaments. Political necessities dominated in importance over commerce, and the requirement for armaments was the prime reason that motivated the interest in philosophy and theology.¹³³

This also indicates that the impetus for this field of interest was initially not external but internal, coming from within the imperial court and bureaucracy.¹³⁴ The indication as to the initial reason for this study comes from Scholarios' correspondence and is reflected in his works, where he offers the following reason; the integrity and the prestige of the Byzantines. The political factor is evident, incorporating the cultural, economic and especially the militaristic policies of both the Latins—the West and the Byzantine Imperial Government in Constantinople—against the Ottoman Turks, which motivates the momentum towards the desired Union.

In Chapter Seven, I will argue that the aforementioned political events, together with the political aspirations of Scholarios, led to his change of position from pro-Union to anti-Union. I will suggest that examination of the cultural, commercial and political influences leads to the conclusion that Scholarios' pro-Union position was primarily motivated by the objective of obtaining military aid. When it became apparent that such aid was not forthcoming, his position changed from pro-Union to anti-Union, as it was politically expedient for him to do so in light of the growing dominance of the Ottoman Turks.

¹³³ There is a lack of proper interpretation of the reason for studying philosophy other than for its discipline alone. The misinterpretation lies in not recognising the political reasons why Scholarios was introduced to this particular study. It also relates to the reason for the writing of his theological works. It is often assumed these subjects were just studied for their own sake, but it only describes the intellectual conviction of individuals in without considering the main reason as to why the pursuits of philosophy and theological subjects were originally fostered.

¹³⁴ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 21.

I argue that Scholarios followed the political policy that was proposed by Dimitrios Kydonis in the fourteenth century of pro-Unionism, and it was not until the political event of the Battle of Varna, 1444, where the ramifications of this battle lay in the realization of the eclipsed power of the Latins. When their military forces lost to the Ottoman Turks, Scholarios formally openly declared his anti-Union stance. Scholarios came to realize the truth of this political scenario, which the Emperor's brother, Despot Dimitrios had been suggesting for some time, even though the imperial authority and the Emperor had not formally acknowledged it.

We can conjecture that his initial enquiries into the unfolding political events of the time were prompted the initial research by Scholarios in this field of studies, which ultimately resulted in his change of opinion of Union. Even though Scholarios' position seems somewhat ambiguous, I would suggest that his service with the Emperor was the catalyst for the political development of his views.

The key factor in the initial enquiry must have its beginnings in Scholarios' reasoning at the start of his philosophical studies and which, I will argue, provided the formation of Scholarios' disposition towards the issues concerning the Union.¹³⁵ I will argue Scholarios was encouraging the pro-Union empathy and position even up to the period of preparation of the military intervention resulting in the event of Varna, although until then he had not openly expressed his opinions against the Union. Thus, I will argue Scholarios was not motivated by theological dictates, but by the realization of political necessities.

¹³⁵ Scholarios vol.VII, the entire volume is dedicated to Aristotelian philosophies pertaining to Christian doctrine, also Scholarios, vols.II, and III relating to the subject of Union; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424.

In conclusion, I will argue that, following my presentation of the evidence as outlined above, the political motivations constitute the strongest reasons for Scholarios' decision to change his stance on the Union.

CHAPTER THREE – SCHOLARIOS AS A PHILOSOPHER

3.1 Philosophical Studies

In this chapter I will explore some of the factors behind Scholarios' change of opinion regarding the Union of churches between East and West, with research into the motive for his introduction to the study of Aristotelian philosophy. I will argue Scholarios' study in philosophy, specifically in rhetoric, logic and physics, and the study of poetry, furnished elements of the political decision he made. I will argue that the imperial bureaucracy was a key influence, which initially promoted Aristotelian philosophy, primarily the study of rhetoric, as a conduit for propaganda, and argued against the re-introduction of Plato's work as recommended by Plethon.

Scholarios is recognised as an excellent Aristotelian philosopher and theological scholar. This appellation is accorded to him by Livanos, who cites Jaroslav Pelikan's work attesting to Scholarios' proficiency in this field of study. He was also accredited with being fluent in Latin, which assisted him in his further studies in philosophy.¹³⁶ His growing admiration for the synthesis of philosophical thought encouraged him to seek further knowledge in this discipline, but it is reputed he could find no adequate tutors, and so had to resort to an autodidactic method of learning.¹³⁷ Turner expresses some doubt about this claim, however, for the simple reason that there were certainly

¹³⁶ Scholarios, 'Scholarios Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus', vol.IV.117; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To his Students', vol.IV.404, 406; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-The same', [Au même (1451-1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 495-496; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 424; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 1.

¹³⁷ Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle', vol. VII. 2-3.

adequate tutors to be found within the imperial bureaucracy as well in the confines of the Latin enclaves in Constantinople.¹³⁸

Turner further argues that the key to understanding Scholarios' study of philosophy is to be found in his political disillusionment with the West, which later led him to renounce the Union of the churches.¹³⁹ There is some support to be found for this argument, particularly in the recent research in this field on the role of philosophical studies and the crucial importance in relation to the policy of imperial propaganda and domestic affairs.¹⁴⁰ One important feature is Scholarios' choice of Aristotelian over Platonist philosophy.¹⁴¹ However, the choice of philosophy was not random: as the annotations to Scholarios' correspondence with Mark Eugenikos also imply, he undertook the study of rhetoric.¹⁴² Byzantine academics were aware of the threefold division of philosophy, and sub-divided practical philosophy into its three traditional elements: politics, economics and ethics.

¹³⁸ Raymond Loenertz and Paul Schreiner, 'The Dominican establishments of Pera-Constantinople', [Les Établissements Dominicains De Péra-Constantinople], *Byzantina Et Franco-Graeca*, articles from 1935 to 1966 (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura 1970), 210–226.

¹³⁹ Scholarios, 'To Despot Demetrius Paleologue. [Against the union (25 December 1452)]', [Au despote Démétrius Paléologue. Contre l'union (25 décembre 1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 174-178 ; Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-To Emperor Constantine. Against the union of Florence', [A l'empereur Constantin. Contre l'union de Florence (12 mars 1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 152 ; Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Lamentation on the Proclamation of the Union at Constantinople', [Lamentation sur la proclamation de l'union à Constantinople], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 180-188; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 424; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 1.

¹⁴⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 8–9; Donald M. Nicol, *The Reluctant Emperor A biography of John Canacuzene, Byzantine emperor and monk*, c.1295-1383. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 143.

¹⁴¹ In terms of the political aspect of Scholarios' choice of philosophies between Platonism and Aristotelianism, the implication is that Aristotle's theories were more compatible with Christianity than Plato's, which is echoed in Livanos' suggestion that Scholarios was primarily interested in Aquinas' philosophical works. The implication links religion and philosophy to the question of political propaganda. See Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21.

¹⁴² Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephese (1440)', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 446. v10.

The inference that the Byzantines did not categorise their own political writings as philosophy should not suggest a lack of interest in political ideas and theories. They utilized this field of study in ideas and theories affecting operational aspects of the Byzantine monarchical constitution.¹⁴³ Turner is correct when he states that philosophy is the underlying feature of politics in Byzantium, but not in the limited sense that he presents it.¹⁴⁴ In the study of philosophy, the successful articulation of argument implies that the oratorical method in the field of rhetoric must be understood and deployed effectively.¹⁴⁵ This is an important element of political negotiation as well.

The sources are appropriately obtained from three categories: imperial propaganda and rhetoric; non-official works of a secular theoretical nature; and the political writing of ecclesiastics. Turner's studies suggest that these fields of studies were pursued for political reasons, and Angelov concurs with this view, although he does not offer as much detail as Turner.¹⁴⁶ It is suggested that in starting his comments on Aristotle using books primarily pertaining to logic, Scholarios demonstrates he understood how Aristotelean methods supported the system that was in place in the imperial court.¹⁴⁷ Scholarios' poems, encomia, his translation of Aquinas' works, (not overlooking the fact that Aquinas was acclaimed as the paramount interpreter of Aristotle) were all designed to enhance the image of the imperial state authority. Scholarios' immediate attention to the name of Averroes in his work against Plethon is intended to solidify the

¹⁴³ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 9.

¹⁴⁴ Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence', 84. Turner is referring to the ecclesiastical politics and does not emphasize the initial source, which is governed by the bureaucratic political element within the imperial authority. He leaves it within the ecclesiastical realm of discussion.

¹⁴⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 10-13. Imperial propaganda, which included court rhetoric and the rituals of imperial ceremonies, sheds light on ideas of kingship. The principle tenets can be discerned in the Byzantine imperial ideas and norms of the selection of an emperor which emphasize charismatic leadership, for example.

¹⁴⁶ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 424-425; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 15. Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VII. ii, iii.

¹⁴⁷ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VII. ii, iii.

argument of Aristotle's consistency with the Christian faith. There were certain interpretations of Aristotle by Averroes who was not a Christian but Mohammedan (Moslem) that were not consistent with Christianity, and the appropriation of Aristotelian philosophical themes, such as free will, with the concept of fatalism, was not congruent with the Christian faith. For some, the association of Aristotelianism and Averroes helped to confirm the incongruity of Aristotle with Christian faith.¹⁴⁸ However Thomas Aquinas' elucidation of Aristotle's philosophy helped to endorse the relation between Aristotelianism and Christianity and for Scholarios the cogency of this link would be reflected in his own works.¹⁴⁹

Aristotelian texts had passed through a period of interpretation, that is, adaptations, in which Aristotle's texts were rearticulated, restructured, and edited, in order to make them more easily understood. This was initially noted by Themistious in the mid-4th century,¹⁵⁰ revived by Michael Psellos in the mid-11th century, and further developed by Sophonias and others in the late 13th to early 14th centuries. In fact Sophonias deliberately endeavoured to combine elements of 'exegetical commentary' with his paraphrase of the *De anima*, in order to be able to preserve more of Aristotle's original wording. These processes of interpreting certain sections of Aristotle's work in addition to the Arabic translations were to be further re-translated by Christian apologetics.

If the translations to Aristotelian philosophies had to be altered to accommodate a Christian conscience, it certainly suggests there were perceived incongruities and discrepancies between Aristotelian philosophy and Christian faith.

¹⁴⁸ Stuart Brown, 'Christian Averroism, Fideism and the "Two-fold Truth"', in *Philosophy in Christianity*, ed. Godfrey Vesey, Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Series 25, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 208-209.

¹⁴⁹ .Papadopoulos, *Orthodoxy and ScholasticTheology*, 1-21.

¹⁵⁰ Frederick Copleston, 'The Translations', in *History of Philosophy, Mediaeval Philosophy, Part 1 Augustine to Bonaventure vol. II.* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, Double Day & Co, 1962), 234.

“Logic indeed is an indispensable instrument for a worthy philosopher”.¹⁵¹ As a discipline, rhetoric provided both a genre and a language for couching political theories in the secular and the theological domains, since it would also foster theological clarification. These political theories were to be found not only in the art of articulation, that is speeches, but also especially in the works of sermons, panegyrics, poetry, funeral orations, admonitions and particularly, as suggested above, in secular political works.

¹⁵² The process of articulation could be perceived from an early period of Hellenic antiquity. The *Iliad* (Ἰλιάς) and the *Odyssey* (Ὀδύσσεια, *Odýsseia*) were two major ancient Hellenic epic poems attributed to Homer (Ὅμηρος) (8th or 9th century BCE). They advanced the skills of effective discourse and they were of considerable subsequent value in the development of prowess in formulating and presenting ideas. It can be said that the expounding of epic poems became a rhetorical tool to help depict an ideology, and advanced the ability of the speaker to influence an audience.¹⁵³

The art of delivery, that is concepts of ideas formulated in speech, became a specific method of instilling philosophical ideas in an audience. It was incorporated in the method that is formulated as rhetoric, in which the ancient philosophers would instruct their students. Plato deployed this form of instruction to his students, one of whom was Aristotle, and subsequently Aristotle advanced it to his school of peripatetic scholars.

¹⁵¹ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VII. iii. See Petit’s comments on the sources of Scholarios’ studies relating to Aristotle. Interest in the corpus of the works by Plato and Aristotle was rekindled in the second half of the ninth century and onwards, when these works were copied and circulated in Byzantium. Aristotelian philosophy comprised studies that were considered important. The imperial bureaucracy was committed to incorporating disciplines that would enhance the political ideology. Rhetoric rather than law was the main conduit that was widely used in this period to express Byzantine political thinking, since it was the art of the persuasive use of language.

¹⁵² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 21. “While the practices of the imperial government and its system of promotions created a close connection between rhetoric and politics, theories advocating a ‘philosophical’ approach to rhetoric, and in particular to imperial panegyric, made rhetorical discourse thoughtful and occasionally theoretical”.

¹⁵³ Homer, *The Odyssey*, Translated by V.Rieu. Revised translation by D.C.H.Rieu. Introduction by Peter Jonas. (London England: Penguin Books Ltd. 1946), xii. On the theme of morality 59; Copleston, ‘Introduction and Patristic Period’, in *History of Philosophy*, vol.1, 29.

The rhetorical tradition that was inherited from these early sources of this system of thought and speech, gave rise to the later rhetorical movement, particularly in Attic thinking. This system of rhetorical delivery, even though initially it was a composition emphasizing an unassuming rather than elaborate form or style of approach to speech, developed in direct contrast to its original endeavour.¹⁵⁴ If this Attic system of rhetorical delivery was reflected in Scholarios' works, it would suggest the method was an essential element of the imperial academy and schools in which Scholarios participated.

It is this frame of mind that motivated Scholarios, as Turner argues, to take up further exploration of philosophy. It is not by coincidence that these categories of panegyrics, poetry, funeral oration and polemic works were reflected in Scholarios' assortment of personal, oratory, poetic, and religious works, as these were mandated and propagated by the norms reflecting the imperial bureaucratic regime, and would be a requirement for anyone who desired to find service with the imperial authority.¹⁵⁵ Hence, the study of philology and philosophy was encouraged, not only by the imperial bureaucracy but also personally by the Emperors.¹⁵⁶ In the West, Aristotelianism became more prominent through the translations of Aristotle's logical works. "... before the twelfth century only part of the *Organon* of Aristotle, the *Catogories* and *On Interpretation*, had been available to medieval philosophers in a Latin version by Boethius, but the entire *Organon* became available fairly early in the twelfth century".¹⁵⁷ The *Organon*, studies of Aristotle's political writings, includes the six works of *Logic* by Aristotle

¹⁵⁴ Scholarios, 'Oratorical Works, Sermons and Panegyric', [Œuvres oratoires, Sermons et Panégyriques], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 1,194.

¹⁵⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18–25.

¹⁵⁶ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* vol.2. 719; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 54. Prime examples can be cited in Manuel Chrysoloras, Dimitrios Kydonis and of course Scholarios.

¹⁵⁷ Copleston, 'Translation', *A History of Philosophy*, vol.2. 232.

(Categories, On Interpretations, Prior Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Topics, and Sophistical Refutations).¹⁵⁸ The question of the historical sequence of the translations of the Organon from the Greek, Latin or Arabic sources is complicated, suffice to say that the entire version titled *Metaphysica nova* or *Translatio nova* was translated from the Greek by the Dominican friar William of Moerbeke. Undertaking the translation of the entire works of Aristotle inspired a philosophical and conceptual revolution, and led to a transformation of the medieval approach to social and political thought, Thomas Aquinas being the prime example.¹⁵⁹ This influential change was recognised by those in power in the East.

Scholarios believed that he could do useful work in aid of the imperial state by beginning with his comments on Aristotle's books pertaining to logic, as logic, indeed, is an indispensable instrument for philosophising well. Vestiges of Aristotle's philosophy are found in two Thomist *Summas*, reflecting not only Aquinas' but also in Scholarios' assimilation of the translated works of Aristotle. Petit comments: [this is] "the work of a teacher (Aquinas) who has fully assimilated the master's (Aristotle) thinking", and this is also reflected in Scholarios' works.¹⁶⁰

Petit goes on to remark that, by 1432-1435 Scholarios had written a great number of philosophical treatises, where he already translated the commentary of Thomas Aquinas on the Second Analytics into Greek. This would also include a large part of tripartite work where Scholarios comments on the 'Isagoge' of Porphyry; 'Κατηγοριῶν Ἐξηγήσεις' (the *Categories*) and 'Περὶ ἑρμηνείας' (On Interpretation) in volume VII.

¹⁵⁸ . See above of the thesis, footnote 9.

¹⁵⁹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 15; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21; Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos*, 232: Livanos writes that, Scholarios seems to have been interested primarily in Aquinas' purely philosophical works. This supports the suggestions that the political agenda, reflected and defined through the discursive culture of public speaking and private correspondence, was the prime reason for the study of philosophy.

¹⁶⁰ Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle', vol. VII.1-7.

The work on Porphyry's 'Isagoge' deserves special attention, as Petit comments, as not only does the work elucidate Aristotelianism, albeit indirectly, but can also be inferred to articulate secular influences reflected in Platonism.¹⁶¹ When Scholarios withdrew to the confines of the monastery he had not limited himself to the quiet of monastic life. Instead he produced noticeable anti-Union apologia as well his defence of Aristotle works. Scholarios' work would deploy a two-pronged approach: one, an opposition to the Union of the churches, and the other, an opposition to the theories of Plethon in his defence of Platonism. The work would then suggest awareness of secular influences, in its philosophical attempts to combat Platonism and secular/pagan influences, which had been infused into Byzantine society.¹⁶² It has been assumed that he was fighting a battle on two fronts, against the Union of the Churches and against a revival of paganism.¹⁶³ However, the reality was more complicated than this, as there was also another component in the battle that was to become a major factor, and that was the Ottoman Turks.

Two key pieces of evidence suggest the political forces at work in and through Scholarios' texts. First, the opening of Scholarios' work begins with a long dedicatory epistle to Constantine Palaiologos, introducing the reason to his work that was to follow, the love of philosophy,¹⁶⁴ and the request for the proper implementation of philosophical theories for political and economical reasons for the good of Fatherland and nation.¹⁶⁵ "The prolegomenon to the logic and the *Isagoge* of Porphyry",

¹⁶¹ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 67.

¹⁶² Ibid. 15, 23, 31, 36, 49.

¹⁶³ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Letter to the Grand Duke against the union of Florence (1451)', [Lettre au Grand Duc contre l'union de Florence], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 146; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 438.

¹⁶⁴ Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle', vol. VII. 2.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. 6-7.

particularly the application of ethics in the procedure of apposite philosophy¹⁶⁶, “a commentary on the Categories¹⁶⁷ and a commentary on the book of Interpretation,¹⁶⁸ is three parts roughly equal to the same work, in which all the work”¹⁶⁹ is, I would suggest and as asserted above, an attempt to counterbalance secular influences.¹⁷⁰ It was intended as an introduction to the study of philosophy that would explain obscure texts. The obscure texts would inspire further study to facilitate clear explanations when there was any urgent necessity. In this case the dialogue with Latins and their Church would be the forefront of all these endeavours, with the aim of consolidating a settlement between them. Scholarios deliberately focuses on particular works of Aristotle for a specific reason; for example, Volumes V and VI are a direct response to Plethon’s attack on Aristotle and correlate to Volume VII, which had a political motive.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁶ Ibid. 7-119. See the section concerning the topic of ethics and its application on 8.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid. 114-237.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. 238-348.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid. Intro. i.

¹⁷⁰ Jonathan Barnes, *Porphyry, an Introduction*. Translation with an Introduction and Commentary by Jonathan Barnes. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2003), xxiii, xxv.

¹⁷¹ Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*, 197; John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus 1391-1425. A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*. (New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press. 1969), 123 See the on going need for political and economic aid requested prior to Emperor John XIII by his father Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos; Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VII.i.

3.2 Power of Rhetoric

Dimiter Angelov supports the view that the political agenda was paramount in the imperial court. Even though he does not throw any light on the fifteenth century, remaining within the period of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, he states that this is the motive behind the study of Aristotelian philosophy, and particularly the discipline of rhetoric.

Rhetoric represents another discipline of philosophy that is extensively deployed as a tool of imperial ideology. “Rhetoric, rather than law, was the main vehicle for the expression of late Byzantine political thought. As is known, rhetoric is the art of persuasive use of language”.¹⁷² This statement associates the advance in political thought through the field of literature that was made by the West in the thirteenth century, with the interest in Aristotelian philosophy, and demonstrates how it was imperative to undertake such studies due to the renewed interest shown by the Byzantine state.¹⁷³

The assertion that individuals with political aspirations in the imperial court or ecclesiastical administration were expected to excel in these topics, as these were the only tools used to argue political or theological ideology, is confirmed in two separate examples reflecting the necessity of these studies. These are the Emperor Manuel II debating with the Mohammedan müderris (scholars), and Kydonis translating the work of the Dominican missionary to the East, Ricoldo of Monte Groce (d. 1320), and the

¹⁷² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18. Political ideologies in rhetorical texts were not phenomena unique to Byzantium but also developed in late medieval Italy, in the city republics. In fact, the cultural renaissance, in intellectual academic research particularly, took on more impetus in the West, while in Byzantium it paled in comparison, according to Angelov.

¹⁷³ Ihor Ševčenko, *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World* (London: Variorum Reprints.1982), IX; George L. Kustas, ‘The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric’, in *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*, vol. 1 (Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikōn, 1973), 1-10; Psellus, *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers*, 257.

‘Refutation of the Quran (Koran)’.¹⁷⁴ We can suggest that the skill of rhetorical presentation was seen as a vitally important skill, and therefore that would suggest a political motive to these translations and dialogues. However, there is another component to the above not solely directed towards the Latins and Ottoman Turks, and that is the issue with Plethon and his support for paganism or, more precisely, the desire to establish a secular domain reflecting the philosophical ideals that Plethon distils from Plato. Both examples suggest a correlation of philosophy and political aspirations, and that the political dimension is the strategic constituent of all philosophical and theological studies. In desiring to further the study of philosophy, Scholarios emphasized the importance of the political context, which can be understood as the West having already initiated political thought concerning civil liberties in the thirteenth century, and the study of philosophy under the Aristotelian influence, which helped to form and guide the West to the formation of Republicanism during the period of the Renaissance.¹⁷⁵ This suggests the reason for Scholarios’ study; in particular, because the discipline of rhetoric was of paramount importance in the study of Aristotelianism and against the Latins and Plethon. The Latins/West had come to believe in the ideals of civil liberties;¹⁷⁶ even though these were, as yet, in a nascent state. This became an issue, especially in their respective political and commercial applications, in Byzantium.

The Latins/West came to Byzantium adequately armed, not only with commercial and military skills, but with an approach to philosophy/theology using persuasive conviction

¹⁷⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 23. “Aristotelianism inspired a philosophical and conceptual revolution and led to a transformation of the medieval approach to social and political thought. Under Aristotelian influence politics emerged as an autonomous discipline and a new set of ideas began to be applied to its discussion.”

¹⁷⁶ Ibid. 23. Angelov reiterates the Western eagerness to absorb the newly “discovered” works of Aristotle was related to the emergence of scholasticism and the dominant position which the scholastic approach came to occupy in the nascent universities during the thirteenth century.

through the discipline of rhetoric in the tradition of scholasticism.¹⁷⁷ The realization of the difference in approach to theology would have been noticeable—the approach to theology in the West was encased in the tradition of scholasticism, which was foreign to Eastern Orthodoxy.¹⁷⁸ Scholarios’ initial motive for furthering his study of Latin literature was not only to confront the Latins, but also confront those with other philosophical/theological persuasions with some knowledge of those arguments, and to prevent the destabilization and alteration of the Byzantine state.¹⁷⁹

The above suggests the way to achieve a resolution in a given argument was through the method of dialectic reasoning, but the initial discipline required to establish a given system of ideas or beliefs was also believed to lie in the discipline of rhetoric, as rhetoric provides both the genres and the language for couching political and theological theories.¹⁸⁰ Aristotelian and Platonist philosophy were intentionally studied, together with rhetoric and theology, as this method of developing dialectic reasoning so as to arrive at given system of concepts was the accepted way to analytically define ideas.¹⁸¹

Christopher Turner argues that Scholarios needed further studies in philosophy to satisfy his thirst for knowledge, going beyond his initial studies. However, as Turner states, “his thirst beyond the initial studies in philosophy” can be understood not solely

¹⁷⁷ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid. 20.

¹⁷⁹ Scholarios, ‘Accord of the Eastern and Western Fathers’, vol. II. 401; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 424; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21. Aquinas’ ability to simplify the practical approach to philosophy, particularly Aristotelianism, appealed to Scholarios. Subsequently, it led Scholarios to further study. Turner states that even though, at first, it was philosophy that drew Scholarios’ attention to Aquinas, this further study would introduce the theological/political arguments that Aquinas presented, especially those that differed from the Christian faith, specifically to the Mohammedans. It was definitely not to enhance his knowledge of Aristotelianism, as the Greeks were receptacles of that tradition of learning from antiquity; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 14. Siniossoglou affirms that rhetoric played an important role in Byzantium and it is customary to note that charges of paganism were often the means to frame a political opponent.

¹⁸⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18.

¹⁸¹ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol. VII. .ii: In this analytical summation, Petit states the various philosophers that were the sources of Scholarios’ studies, extending from Aristotle to Aquinas: Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 14.

as a desire to to further indulge in reflections on abstract discussion and theoretical articulation, but as a means to refine the expression of political ideas. The understanding of Aristotelian philosophical explication was imperative for students who desired further advancement in this particular field.¹⁸²

Aristotle's logical conclusions from his speculations on philosophical reasoning were seen to enable the furtherance of important political ideas, rhetoric being a discipline of philosophy whose procedures and categories were used extensively late antiquity.¹⁸³

“The device of rhetoric must be adapted to serve not merely an empire but to serve the Christian empire of the East, with its political roots in its Roman past and its cultural hereitage; the educational ideals and its techniques of late Antiquity”.¹⁸⁴ In addition, as rhetoric was a discipline that was strongly emphasised in higher education in Byzantium, it would be emulated by those who sought engagement with state imperial service. One example that Angelov provides is that of Theodore Metochitis—a Byzantium prime minister (mesazon) in the early part of the fourteenth century—who recounts in his autobiography that his display of rhetorical skills to the Emperor had ensured his entry into the civil service at a young age. What it also engendered was the combination of rhetoric and philosophy, for it encompassed philosophical discourse as an alternative access to theoretical interpretations, as appropriate to the subject indicated.¹⁸⁵ Even though it is not formally stated, it can be suggested that Scholarios had to progress in the same manner as Metochitis.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 20; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius’, 422, 424.

¹⁸³ Angelov *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18. Angelov cites George Kustas on the development of rhetoric in Byzantium. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Thessalonki, 1973), See 18, footnote 49.

¹⁸⁴ Kustas, ‘The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric’, 1.

¹⁸⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 22; Gregory Akindynos, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*; Greek text and English Translation by Angela Constantinides Hero; Dumbarton Oaks Texts, 7.

During the dynastic beginnings of the Palaiologan, Emperor Michael VIII revived court practices and traditions that had lapsed during the Byzantines' period in exile at Nicaea.¹⁸⁷ Court officials such as Manuel Holobolos (Μανουήλ Ὁλόβολος); ca. 1245 – 1310/14, Maximos being his monastic appellation) were given the office and title of rhetor of rhetors, a newly established position in the Patriarchal administration, which as the title infers, was the position of rhetorician.¹⁸⁸ This noted panegyrist born ca.1245, died in Constantinople between 1310-14, having suffered horrifically by being mutilated under Emperor Michael for his opposition to the blinding of legitimate Emperor John IV Laskaris and also for his opposition to pro- Union opinions.¹⁸⁹ It is noted that rhetorical pieces were utilized by experienced orators who paid great attention to foreign policy and were familiar with Aristotle's logical treatises. In fact, under Michael VIII, Aristotle was widely studied in schools of higher learning.

Rhetorical treatises such as the '*Rhetoric of Aristotle*' emphasized by Holobolos, Emperor Michael VIII's rhetor, outlined the conditions of how an encomium should be transcribed in dealing with family, birth, external appearance, and virtues of the person praised, but this applied to the other studies such as homilies, poetry and so forth.¹⁹⁰ The curriculum of Byzantine secondary education traditionally favoured the study of rhetoric through the corpus of Hermogenes, indicating the persuasive direction of reason as the justification for this course of studies.¹⁹¹ With the implication that Nikephoros

(Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, Research Library and Collection 1983), 37-47. A example of the rhetoric –philosophical tradition can be seen in Gregory Akindynos letter to Barlaam.

¹⁸⁶ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 20; Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 8.

¹⁸⁷ Geanakoplos, *Byzantium*, 407-408.

¹⁸⁸ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 68; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium*, 408; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation', 80-81, 85-87.

¹⁸⁹ Kazhdan, 'Manuel Holobolos', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 940; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 74; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation', 81.

¹⁹⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 69.

¹⁹¹ Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation', 82-83; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 54, 63. Also see: C. N. Constantinides, 'Higher Education in Byzantium in

Blemmydis studied rhetoric by reading Hermogenes, Maximos Planoudis, translator of Augustine's works '*De Trinitate*' produced a new edition of Hermogenes' corpus; this delineates the purpose of this particular course of study.¹⁹² The description of the functions of the grand rhetor in the fifteenth century can be applied to Scholarios' functions during the late period of the Palaiologoi, with one marked difference; the function of the grand rhetor in the sixteenth century was entirely concerned with issues of dogma.¹⁹³

Scholarios was not so much motivated by the study of philosophy *per se*— just for the love of it—but by what could be achieved by using it as an instrument of persuasive argument, directed by the imperial ideology.¹⁹⁴ As has been inferred, theology was also used in this process of developing and promoting political ideology.¹⁹⁵ At the start of his career in the imperial service, it seems that Scholarios was encouraged towards one goal; a reading of his personal letters from this period would indicate political aspirations nurtured within the confines of the imperial bureaucracy.¹⁹⁶ Emphasis on foreign policy made it obligatory for all those who aspired to serve in the imperial bureaucracy, or that of the ecclesiastical administration, to study philosophy, because of

the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204–ca. 1310), Texts and Studies of the History of Greece, 11. (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 1982).

¹⁹² Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-The Cause of the Schism', [Les cause du schisme], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.II. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), 9; Scholarios, 'Liturgic and Poetic Works', [Œuvres liturgiques et poétiques], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 328; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 54–55; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424; Above all, Scholarios has continual recourse to Augustine's and Aquinas' speculation of theology, which demonstrates the correlation with these studies; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 10.

¹⁹³ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 47.

¹⁹⁴ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424.

¹⁹⁵ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters', vol. IV. 410–421; Aristeides Papadakis, 'Gennadius II and Mehmet the Conqueror', *Byzantion* 42, (1972): 88–89.

¹⁹⁶ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic', vol. III. 7, 26–27; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 281. Scholarios is estimated to have begun his service in 1420–1425 and that the introduction and subsequent study of Aristotelian philosophy would have occurred in this period.

the dialectic and rhetorical studies that were necessary to communicate politically with political adversaries.

Ascertaining the guidelines of rhetoric according to Aristotelian philosophical concepts seemed to be the norm. Rhetor Manuel Holobolos, an Aristotelian adherent, is noted for emphasizing its many commendable virtues¹⁹⁷—generosity, experience, fairness, sagacity, righteousness, intelligence—beyond the four cardinal virtues derived from the fourth book of ‘*Plato’s Republic*’ and all those virtues on which Aristotle and other ancient moral philosophers had once set great store.¹⁹⁸ Holobolos was not the only adherent of the Aristotelian philosophical guidelines of rhetoric; Maximos Planoudis was another, as were historian Nikephoros Gregoras, and theologian Gregory Palamas.¹⁹⁹ The last two displayed their rhetorical skills in front of Andronikos II, as did Theodore Metochitis, prior to the Emperor permitting them entry into the civil service at a young age.²⁰⁰ This tradition of presentation would include Scholarios when

¹⁹⁷ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 52.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid. 55.

¹⁹⁹ Nikephoros Gregoras, *Roman History* [Ῥωμαϊκῆς Ἱστορίας], P.G.148, 19A-94B, 119A-1450B. See the biographical explanation on rhetorical studies of Gregoras and John Glykeos under tutelage of Theodore Metochites; Fisher, ‘Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation’, 95-96. Holobolos and Planoudes were able to translate Latin works into Greek due to the free interactions between the communities of the Byzantines and Latins in Constantinople, but in particular Holobolos and Planoudes made contact with the Latin monasteries in Constantinople; See also, Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 104-107; Woodhouse, Gemistos Plethon, 81: this discussion concerns the complex issue of defining who was Platonist or Aristotelian particularly in terms of the variance stances of philosophy that promoted the secular or Hellenistic movement and towards the theological doctrine of Hesychasm. Woodhouse would count Palamas as a Platonist whereas Siniossoglou correctly argues Palamas was an opponent to the secular initiative that was being applied to political/theological themes; A.N. Williams, *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas*. (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 20; Doru Costache, ‘Theology and Natural Science in St. Gregory Palamas’, in *God, Freedom and Nature*, eds. Ronald S. Laura, Rachel A. Buchanan, Amy K. Chapman (Sydney-New York-Boston: Body and Soul Dynamics, 2012), 133; Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. (Cambridge and London: James Clarke and Co. Ltd, 1968), 104; John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1998), 120.

²⁰⁰ Theodore Metochites, *Miscellaneous of Philosophy and History* [Miscellanea philosophica et historica]. ed. C.G.Muller and T.Kiessling. (Leipzig, 1821), 14-16.

he sought civil service with the imperial authority under Emperor John VIII Palaiologos.²⁰¹

As has been suggested, “Rhetoric was the skill concerning the power of speech in political matters, having as its purpose the persuasive discourse by accepted means to articulate a conceived ideology”.²⁰² Both Planoudis and Holobolos had professional reasons for translating Latin treatises on grammar and rhetoric, as both were noticeable mentors who fortified their students with proficiency in grammar and rhetoric, the traditional implements required for advancement and success in public life and imperial service.²⁰³ The official line was that the students were generally animated by a genuine love for philosophy; however, the skills acquired clearly also had other applications. Proficiency in the use of grammar and rhetoric were also helpful for advancement and success in public life and imperial service. The state and the ecclesiastical spheres would demand very high standards and exceptional quality in the presentation of rhetorical training for the Byzantines to be able to engage to dialogue with conflicting political forces. Understanding Holobolos’ and Planoudis’ positions requires an awareness of this background, which could be used to describe Scholarios’ own work as well.²⁰⁴ If rhetoric is defined in terms of a discursive culture of public speaking, then the authors, writers and orators who were either in service or belonged to

²⁰¹ Scholarios, ‘Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus’, vol. IV.117-8; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought* 20.

²⁰² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought* 63, 69. It should be noted here that Holobolos position before attaining the title and position of Rhetor of rhetors was imperial secretary to Michael VIII—a position that Scholarios would hold approximately one hundred and seventy four years later to the then Emperor John VIII Palaiologos.

²⁰³ Fisher, ‘Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation’, 80.

²⁰⁴ Scholarios, ‘Funerial Eulogies’, [Eloges funèbres], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 1-61; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought* 43–48, 95. “Holobolos is credited with illustrating the importance of applying rhetorical studies, when his rhetorical piece demonstrated that an experienced orator who paid great attention to foreign policy and was familiar with Aristotle’s logical treatises, encapsulates the prominence retained in the tradition of this specific study”; Fisher, *Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation*. 81, 95.

or addressed the social elite, found in study of rhetoric a necessary and indispensable tool. They would exemplify these tools and techniques in their oratory or correspondence, in accordance with the demands of the rhetorical tradition.²⁰⁵ In fact Psellos, Holobolos and Planoudis, who imitated previous authorship in the course of studies of philosophy, were to use rhetoric to its maximum effect. These individuals created public and private personae that exploited the capabilities afforded by the rhetorical tradition. This deployment of ancient techniques was also imitated by Scholarios and suggests his works are also prime examples of this continuous rhetorical tradition.²⁰⁶

The position of secretary and General Judge held by both Holobolos and Scholarios, together with the study of Aristotelian philosophy as a means for political articulation in rhetoric, would indicate the continuous tradition within the apparatus of the imperial bureaucracy throughout the Palaiologan dynasty.²⁰⁷ It is significant that the position of General Judge was also held by Plethon, because the role was specifically to examine the various divergent political and religious facets within the empire. It suggests that when Scholarios addresses the Latins on doctrinal issues, but also Plethon and the Ottoman Turks, that the political welfare of the empire is foremost in his mind.

²⁰⁵ Papaioannou, Michael Psellos, 232.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To an unknown', [A un inconnu], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935),436; Syropoulos, *Vera historia unionis non verae*, 22, 29; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought* 47, see also 61–63.

3.3 Imperial Propaganda

According to Turner, Scholarios' assertion about being self-taught is an exaggeration, when he states that he could not find adequate tutors to fulfil his desire for further studies.²⁰⁸ In particular, the imperial state bureaucracy utilized experienced orators who paid great attention to foreign policy and were familiar with Aristotle's logical treatises.²⁰⁹ Furthermore the Latin enclaves in different parts of the city would have afforded adequate tutors in this field of learning.

It was important to avoid any implication of association with the Latins, so any personal feelings about Union are thus 'excised'.²¹⁰ It may be speculated that Scholarios' claims about being self-taught were put forward to eliminate any association with views perceived as being for or against the Union, and for reasons of political conformity.²¹¹

The observation concerning the close connection between rhetoric and politics reaffirms Turner's four chief explanations and confirms the reason for the study of philosophy, for the imperial government's system of promotions created a close relationship between rhetoric and politics. Theories advocating a 'philosophical' approach to rhetoric, panegyrics, poetry and eulogies often reflected the policies of the imperial authority, rather than solely recommending imitation of the ancient Greek tradition. Certainly such imitation is to be found in the works of Scholarios. Angelov makes the acute observation that court orators never admitted that they were composing historical accounts and took pains to distinguish themselves from historians, referring to

²⁰⁸ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephese', vol.IV. 446.

²⁰⁹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 69.

²¹⁰ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephese', vol.IV. 446; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 69, 'therefore, it was necessary to research more ancient manuscripts, which are less marked with self-censorship for himself and the state.'

²¹¹ Scholarios, 'Commentaries on the Works of Aristotle', vol.VII.2-3; Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence', 96.

themselves instead as rhetoricians, poets or eulogists. This would suggest that any political or personal opinion expressed by the orators would reflect the imperial directives.²¹²

The use of Aristotelian philosophy in dialectical reasoning to analytically define political as well as theological knowledge by the method of inference would also be postulated in Platonism within the discipline of ethics; Gemistos Plethon is a prime example of the promotion and popularity of this philosophy.²¹³

Thus under the discipline of studying Aristotelianism and Platonism, philosophy was being emphasized as a political discipline essential for imperial welfare and propaganda. Dialectical reasoning provided a standard of judgement influential in forming Scholarios' opinion of Union, "which was influenced by his situation: from the moment he took an official role, he aligned himself more or less with the politics defined by the Emperor".²¹⁴ Observation endorses the political possibilities inherent in the development of these philosophical and theological themes.²¹⁵

Scholarios immersed himself thoroughly in the demands of the service of the imperial bureaucracy, and was obedient to the directives they issued.²¹⁶ His preliminary studies in poetry, logic and rhetoric, and advances in his study of philosophy all suggest

²¹² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 20, 21.

²¹³ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 191. See this chapter on *de Differentiis* and on the Book of Laws, 322, regarding the establishment of the Hellenic state; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, Siniosoglou also clarifies admirably the concept of establishing a Hellenic state. See 15, 71, 369.

²¹⁴ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 281.

²¹⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 43–48, 105; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 100.

²¹⁶ Turner, Jugie and Blanchet all identify this political characteristic in Scholarios' work, even though it is only implied, whereas Angelov specifically explicates these political intricacies in his study of the period of the Laskarid and the early Palaiologan dynasties by individuals in service to the imperial authority. This exemplifies the political structure of Scholarios' studies and works, since he was a direct inheritor of this system.

furtherance of the imperial directive,²¹⁷ particularly bearing in mind that Scholarios had sufficient knowledge of philosophy by 1432-1435 such that he had written, commented and translated several philosophical tracts.²¹⁸

Method and Position of Rhetor

In the pursuit of further tutoring in “the higher learning” of philosophy—as Scholarios states for ‘love of philosophy’,²¹⁹ a part of the process is dedicated to the study of poetry.²²⁰ It reinforces the tradition the Byzantines had nurtured for centuries, emerging from antiquity. It was not only a particular art or form of poetic expression, but a living expression of a commitment to certain ideas and values that was repeated within the church liturgical language, and was also endemic in the language of the average person in Byzantine society, a tradition of the Greek language and culture that had been passed down by many generations, over the centuries.²²¹

To excel in particular studies, students and writers were required to study and imitate these early works, not only in the sphere of logic but also in the art of poetic expression, for these were the principal standards that would remain as a cultural force that guided those who sought further studies.²²² For one thing, it helps to explain the wide-ranging

²¹⁷ Scholarios, ‘Antilatin Polemic’, vol.III. 7, 26–27; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius’, 424.

²¹⁸ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VII. ii.

²¹⁹ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries on the Works of Aristotle’, vol. VII. 2v29–34.

²²⁰ The example of the “Acrostiche iambique” poem is an illustration of the Iambic Acrostic verses, which, as is noted by Petit, is reminiscent of the Greek satirists, and a copy of the original work, of the year 1535. The year of composition of the poem does indicate that Scholarios was from an early age acquiring classical sources of Aristotelian philosophy, and he continued to be influenced by this classical tradition.

²²¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 38.

²²² Scholarios was directly emulating the poetic tradition fostered by the ancient writers, since celebratory and lamenting rhythmical poetry are to be found in the ecclesiastical sphere. Three prime examples are embedded in the consciousness of Orthodox Christians. These are: The Great Canon of Saint Andrew from the seventh century, chanted during the Great Lent on Wednesday in the fifth week; the chanting of the Akahistos Hymn in the same week as that of the Canon and the verses or penitential Troparion of

variation in the panegyrics' style, language and function at court, with no one encomium being identical with another. All were written in a laudatory and celebratory style, "sufficient textual clues pointing to a tendency of the speakers to display publicly their individual interests and political concerns".²²³

All were couched in what their authors deemed 'Attic Greek', with some exceptions in the Ionic dialect,²²⁴ observing the rhetorical style with the artificial and grandiloquent linguistic terminologies of the language and cadenced style, sometimes to the point of absurdity, in seeking to imitate the Greeks of antiquity.²²⁵ These devices were all deployed by Scholarios.²²⁶ An illustration is the content of the Sermon for Holy Friday which appears to be quite dogmatic, a repetition of the sermon for the feast of the Annunciation on the primitive state of man, original sin and the divine plan of the Incarnation. In this sermon, as in most of the others in the collection of sermons in

Kassiani, chanted on the Tuesday of Holy Week. The existence of these laudatory poems, intertwined with panegyric, penitential, and lamentations indicates the long-standing nature of the poetic tradition.

²²³ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV. 369-397. Scholarios in the application of his poetic works in this section demonstrates Scholarios observance to state protocol in poetic and rhetorical regulations; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 52, 58, 61. Imperial panegyrics occupied an important place in the generic classifications of Byzantine rhetoric. The chief theoretician of rhetoric in Byzantium, Hermogenes (second century A.D.), adopted the triple generic division of oratory suggested by Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (1358b); judicial, deliberative or counselling, and epideictic or panegyric. The last category of rhetoric, the epideictic, can be described as the rhetoric of praise and blame as well as of public display and celebration. It included speeches such as encomia, epitaphs, consoling speeches, invectives, nuptial orations, and welcoming addresses.

²²⁴ It is noted that the tradition is still emphasised by orators in public and ecclesiastical forums and remains, even today, endemic within the ecclesiastical sphere. Although Angelov uses the term 'high Greek', it is a known fact that the form of Greek that was reported as being presented was the Attic dialect, which Scholarios also utilized.

²²⁵ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV. 378, 383. In articulating Attic Greek, Scholarios advocates the classical resurgence of learning, in that he faithfully mimics the traditions of ancient Greece that were adhered to in the study of philosophy. This is not to be misunderstood as promoting a pagan identity, but rather the method of articulation and mimesis that reflects Ancient Greek culture. (See above page 50 of this thesis). By using Attic Greek, and not the nuances of the Greek language used in the Byzantine period of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it is evident that the intellectual pursuit of classical studies is very pronounced. As there is a definite mimesis in the style of presentation in accordance with ancient Greece, this would suggest that the poems were meant for the theological instruction of those Byzantines who were willing to change their beliefs to accommodate the economic/political pressures.

²²⁶ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV. 369; Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Vol. II.488.

Volume I of Scholarios' works, the presenter clearly draws on Thomas Aquinas, however, also incorporating a political message in the theological text.²²⁷

Scholarios' position as private secretary/chancellor to the Emperor, and, following his return from the Council of Florence, the resumption of his position as Judge General of the Romioi and Didaskalos to the imperial court, further extended his function within the court, as advisor in philosophical and religious affairs. Recent research has revealed an ecclesiastical dimension to his sundry titles and roles. Scholarios' ecclesiastical function incorporates a role that allows him to admonish as well as to instruct: thus, Scholarios was fulfilling a political as well as an ecclesiastical role.²²⁸

Scholarios' function and title are significant, as Scholarios' poems are bound to be reflective of his position and, as such, they indicate a political as well as an instructive religious component in the composition. The role of Judge General was an advisory and inspectorial position and as such Scholarios' poetry, correspondences and other works confirm that the primary scope of his office as theological advisor was more as advisor on foreign affairs, as Scholarios' advisory role at the Council of Florence demonstrates. It is revealing that the bureaucratic position attained by Scholarios was a succession of the same position held by Holobolos, who was secretary and rhetor under Emperor Michael XI Palaiologos.²²⁹ Hence, the positions of secretary/Didaskalos, Judge General and Chancellor were important supervisory positions in foreign and domestic affairs of the Byzantine Empire. The need to supervise philosophical and

²²⁷ Scholarios, 'Sermons and Panegyric', vol. I, 1, 194,

²²⁸ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic', vol.III. 21. The perceptive fact that secular functions, normally associated with rhetors, were to be reincorporated again as positions under the ecclesiastical authorities contributed to the selectivity in Scholarios' poetic composition.

²²⁹ Scholarios, 'Scholarios Letter of Transmittal of the previous Book to Mark of Ephesus', vol. IV. 117, 25–30; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To his Students', vol.IV.406; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 140-141. Laurent comments in footnote concerning Scholarios position at court: footnote.8; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 425; Gill, *Council of Florence*, 19; Geanakoplos, *Byzantium*. See extracts from primary sources, 407-408; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 38, 51-53.

theological difficulties implies that this need arose from the presence of adversary elements and the influence they were exerting on the Empire; as Scholarios explains, he found the study of logic particularly weak in Byzantium. The importance of oratory was to be able to articulate intricate philosophical and theological matters as effectively as possible.

Scholarios not only emulated Aristotle's work, but also incorporated the established models that were a part of the imperial court stipulations concerning rhetoric. Byzantine court orators and the imperial chancery followed established models, and openly admitted to this.²³⁰ The orators themselves referred to the existence of rhetorical rules in their speeches.²³¹ Scholarios repeatedly followed the same rules.²³² Poems and philosophical works would be orchestrated towards this theme of political propaganda.²³³ Holobolos's poetry, panegyric, and oratory in the early 1300s described the magnificence and brilliance of court ceremonies and promoted official imperial

²³⁰ Scholarios, 'Funerary Eulogies-Scholarios Lamentations of his Life', vol.I. 247–389; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters', vol.IV. 398–503.

²³¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 50. See footnote. 73. For example, addressing the emperor with the respectful phrase "it was necessary that you", used by Scholarios to address the Emperor Constantine in his letter to him of 1450, repeating a previous acknowledgement of the imperial personage. This is a common use, considering that Laskarids and Palaiologan imperial chanceries repeated the same preamble in two different documents, demonstrating the habit of reusing and rehashing old material. The proliferation of examples in the varieties of poetic methods indicates on-going attention to politics in their presentation. See Scholarios, 'To Emperor Konstantine', vol.IV. 463, for the example cited above in reference to the letter to Emperor Constantine.

²³² Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV.369-397. The context of Scholarios' poems does not eliminate the sense of drama inherent therein. The poems imitate not only exactly what Aristotle had emphasized in the language of presentation, but also etymologically, in the rhythm and melody of each word reflecting the previous sentence and that of the next sentence to follow. Each poem explains theological instructions through reasoning and prayer—using diction to convey an instruction to the reader, encased in prose poetry that heightened the imagery and emotional effects. One style that is noticeably absent in Scholarios' poetry is encomiastic poetry: many poems were written in this style in the previous century.

²³³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-to Mark Eugenikos', vol. IV. 445; Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol. IV.394. Two extensive examples are notable in the Canon in Honour of Gregory Palamas and the eulogy and poem dedicated to Mark Eugenikos. The subject of interest incorporates the theological debates, not only with the Latins but also within the Byzantine culture of this period. Their classifications are to be found in the resounding theological debates of Hesychasm and the Latin theological dissimilarity of the Filioque Clause.

propaganda.²³⁴ Scholarios' works likewise promoted and enforced official imperial propaganda: a necessity in the ensuing theological debates, undertaken for political reasons.²³⁵

The genre of court rhetoric also incorporated the tradition of epitaphs and eulogies.²³⁶ These often contained praise of the rulers in burial orations.²³⁷ The period during which these poems, "selection of inward prayers"²³⁸ were written lasted from 1431 to well after the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks also confirms the political context of the religious developments.²³⁹ Political concern is reflected in Scholarios' poem, rather a hymn to be chanted in the fourth tone, the '*Prayer for the Wellbeing of the Peloponnese*', dated 1452, which suggests by the words utilized, the petitioning God the

²³⁴ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 61, 63, 64. Manuel Holobolos held the same position as Scholarios as secretary and as rhetor to the Imperial court a century before.

²³⁵ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol.II. 706.

²³⁶ Scholarios, 'Funerial Eulogies', vol.I. 247, 255,262,277.The epitaph/eulogy of Mark of Ephesus, although there is some doubt as to the authenticity of this epitaph as noted by Petit, although follows the guidelines of Aristotelian logic. Reputedly written by Scholarios in 1444, it epitomizes the style of presentation that has been described above. The poetic deliverance of the words that are presented in the beginning section is in adulation of the person, in this case Eugenikos, which is reminiscent of the style of approach to the emperors in the panegyric preambles and eulogies of the early part of the fourteenth century.

²³⁷ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol. IV. 377,379, 384; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 50. See footnote.71. Angelov cites six speeches designed for imperial funerals that survive from this period. Originally, these works were composed for the purpose of oral recitation to the weeping imperial family, but it is apparent that in the later Palaiologan period these works did not pertain solely to imperial personages, as is clearly demonstrated by examples of Scholarios' eulogies. This genre of eulogies composed by Scholarios imitates the genre of eulogies as dictated by Aristotelian rhetoric. Even though the majority of the eulogies are theological in matter, there are a few that are epitaphs. For example, Dimitrios Laskaris Leontaris's epitaph composed in about 1431, Theodore Scholarios Sophianos's epitaph in 1456, Scholarios' nephew's epitaph in 1456, and the epitaph of Makarios, Abbot of the Pantocrator monastery in Constantinople are noticeable for following this genre of rhetoric, where this form of praise is transmitted to private individuals rather than those with imperial status.

²³⁸ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol. IV.369–397. There is a direct indication of the confrontation the Byzantines were experiencing in the city of Constantinople with the Latins, and which was emphasized by the Byzantines' disquiet over the enormous influence and proselytism the Latins were projecting, and about which Joseph Gill states "they [that is the Byzantines] were not edified by their missionary zeal".

²³⁹ Ibid. 371.In the poems '*Choice of Prayers in Verse*', dedicated to the adoration of God the Father, and another poem to the adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and subsequently to the veneration of the Theotokos and John the Baptist, it is obvious that the primary theme is theological. However, the manner of presentation of these poems, other than the mimesis of the ancient Greek culture, denotes an instructive motive directed to those untutored in the Christian faith.

Father to save Peloponnese as He protects the City of Constantinople.²⁴⁰ It would indicate the known threat that of the siege and conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mehmed was imminent and also emphasized the need to protect “the vulnerable Eastern Orthodox minority in the Peloponnese that witnessed the rise and suffered under the spread of a pagan plague”.²⁴¹ It is an explicit reference to two major political problems that posed a threat to the security and stability of the Christian Byzantine Empire and were perceived by Scholarios. This could be characterised as a double threat, one that emphasized the Islamization but also the revitalization of a pagan ethos.

This evidence suggests Scholarios’ poems are political as well as religious in context and also that religious conformity was as important to the imperial authorities as the ecclesiastical authorities.²⁴² Certain poems fell into the category of rhythmic poetry, so-called because they repeated stressed and unstressed syllables, for instance the Melodic Hymn of God.²⁴³ The hymn reflects—other than the theological context—the apostasy of the Greeks, relating to the church Union between the Byzantines and Latins, although

²⁴⁰ Ibid. 385. The public performance of imperial panegyrics and burial orations distinguishes these works from encomia concerning the emperor, which were incorporated into private letters or book dedications. Scholarios likewise incorporated the *pleroma* of this information in his private letters as well as in his eulogies and panegyrics. A protracted form of panegyrics can be associated with the term “*Canon*” in the presentation of tributes.

²⁴¹ Scholarios, ‘Antilatin Polemic’, vol.III., 146; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 151; Necipoglu Nevra Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 275.

²⁴² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 65. This does not necessarily mean that he did not write any, as many copies of Scholarios’ work could have been lost during the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks. Scholarios incorporated the classical studies as perceived by the Byzantines in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but used the studies of classical Greek traditions as a tool for dialectic reasoning for pressing political necessities. His meticulous emulation of language and laudatory terms makes it evident which source of influence Scholarios is emulating and the scope to which he is directing. In this, Scholarios was an ardent follower of both Aristotle and the directives of the state imperial bureaucracy.

²⁴³ Ibid. 77; Scholarios, Poetic Works-Translation of a hymn Synesius’, [Traduction d’une hymne Synésius], vol.IV.369-71 It is annotated that the above poems are dedicated to the adoration of God the Father. In the final verses of the poem the words “Hail” are an analogy of the terminologies of the Salutation service in the Akathistos or Unseated Hymn in honour of the Holy Theotokos during the first five Fridays of Lent.

Scholarios had by this time become an ardent anti-Unionist. Suffice to say, Scholarios observed the guidelines to the letter, with due attention to foreign policy.²⁴⁴

The hymn dedicated to the Trinity and to the petitioning of the mercy of God the Father. The acknowledgement of the Divinity of Jesus Christ and also honouring the Theotokos (Mother of God), protection by the Holy Angels, John the Baptist and the Holy Apostles. Towards the end of the hymn articulating to intercede as was shown in the mercy towards good thief, the tax collector and prodigal son. It is in this last phrase, which reflects what had been stated above for to annunciate the three examples would denote the political turmoil that Scholarios and fellow Byzantines were experiencing.²⁴⁵

3.4 Adaptation of Aristotle's and Aquinas' Works

In the period from the thirteenth century onwards, the West experienced a re-awakening of the discipline of Aristotelian philosophy, primarily Aristotle's '*Versions*' of Physics, Ethics and Politics. What is significant is that Thomas Aquinas made constant use of the translation of Aristotle's versions of Physics and Politics and Scholarios frequently referred to it throughout his works.²⁴⁶ In Volume VII in the introduction to '*Porphyre*',

²⁴⁴ However, not all the poems can be considered totally religious in matter, nor to be read for personal purpose, but they are addressed to the public as well and Scholarios stressed that the poems were to be read for general consumption for advisory tutoring. This can be seen in two examples of his poems, '*On the Brevity of Life and the Escape of the World*,' dated 1447, and '*The Exhortation to Youth*.' Both these poems probably reflect the period of Scholarios' sorrow over the death of Emperor John and his final decision to depart from the service of the imperial bureaucracy, and as such, the poems instruct as well as admonish, reflecting on his own life and decisions. See, Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV. 378,383.

²⁴⁵ Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV. 393.

²⁴⁶ Apostolos D Karpozilos, *St Thomas Aquinas and the Byzantine East*. (On Essence and Operation -De essentia et operatione). *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 52, (1970): 129-147; Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 13. Apostolos Karpozilos attests to the fact that a Thomistic circle of devotees had been established in the imperial palace in Constantinople, especially after the recent translation by Dimitrios Kydonis of Aquinas' theological speculations and his subsequent commentaries on Aristotle. He continues by saying "this pro-Latin movement during the fourteenth century exerted a great influence on the Byzantines' thought, extending its effect to many Orthodox intellectuals", which Barbour extrapolates to mean that it was fashionable to be a Thomist at the Imperial court.

Scholarios' commentaries refer to metaphysics in explaining the '*Categories of Aristotle*'.²⁴⁷

This observation is reaffirmed by Scholarios' reflections on Thomas Aquinas' works in the fifteenth century; Scholarios advocates Aristotelian first principles and causality²⁴⁸ in his translation of '*Summa Theologica*'. The work adheres to Aristotle's '*Metaphysics, Book Alpha*', which designates this philosophy as the knowledge of the first principles or causes of things.

In the whole part of Volume VI of Scholarios' works, he commits to Thomas Aquinas' '*Commentaries*' on Aristotle's work '*De anima*' (Περὶ ψυχῆς), having commented extensively already, and dedicating a large portion of his work to translating and commenting. However, this was not the only work he refers to, as he also constantly refers to *De ente et essentia* (Περὶ Διαφορᾶς Οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι). If the rhetorical method is to be employed, then the Aristotelian rhetorical canon must be evoked, as it is judicial, deliberative and epideictic in the presentation of these philosophical works.²⁴⁹

This suggests the motive for Scholarios' translation of the '*Commentaries*' on the works of Aristotle, is the same as that of Thomas Aquinas, namely a Christian apologia (defence), exhibiting an understanding the political necessity of applying the rhetorical method, since "the practices of the imperial government and its system of promotions created a close connection between rhetoric and politics (including theology), and theories advocating a 'philosophical' approach in promoting imperial propaganda".²⁵⁰

²⁴⁷ Scholarios, '*Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-Isagoge of Porphyrios*', vol.VII. 67, v19–20, 35.

²⁴⁸ Brian Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 63.

²⁴⁹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 23, 52.

²⁵⁰ Ibid. 21.

Scholarios likewise utilized Aquinas' dialectical approach in an effort to clarify the imperial political ideology more efficiently, as it encompasses the use of philosophy as a tool to promote imperial political and ecclesiastical policy.²⁵¹ An important cause that united Aquinas and Scholarios was their struggle to confront the increasing presence of the Mohammedans, Arab or Ottoman Turks. However, it also helped to address the Byzantine political problem with the Latins and, especially for Scholarios, with the added incentive of the need to address his domestic problem, the need to combat re-paganised or secular influences.²⁵² I will discuss this topic in Chapter Five, when I consider the perceived threat posed by Plethon's promotion of a de-Christianised Platonism.

Thomas Aquinas stipulates that the purpose of his '*Commentaries*' on Aristotle is to provide an instrument of persuasion: "[to] point out, in debating with heretical Christians, that one can have recourse to the entire Bible, but to debate with Jews the only option is recourse to the Old Testament. However, with Mohammedans and pagans the only common authoritative text that one must have recourse to is natural reasoning".²⁵³

This statement must be seen as significant in understanding Scholarios' strong dedication to theological and political accuracy as perceived by the imperial state. For Scholarios' acquiescent observance of the philosophical concepts of Aristotle and the theological exegesis of these philosophical precepts of Aristotle by Aquinas reflects the intensity of the political agenda in Scholarios' work. The philosophical rhetorical studies undertaken just prior to Scholarios' early schooling illustrate the requirements of

²⁵¹ Ibid. 60.

²⁵² Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 74.

²⁵³ Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, (cite: Book 1, Chapter 2 *Summa contra Gentiles*), 21.

the Byzantine education curriculum for all in the service of the imperial bureaucracy,²⁵⁴ since rhetoric was “the skill concerning the power of speech in political matters, having as its purpose the persuasive discourse by accepted means and topics of poems, panegyrics, preambles, which complement themselves neatly in the investigation of government ideology”²⁵⁵

One dominant public image of the Palaiologan dynasty was that it had imperialistic claims to world domination and political universalism.²⁵⁶ Scholarios incorporated these ideals, nurtured in the confines of the imperial court bureaucracy, to explicate the role of Constantinople as bearer of a universalist political ideology. The application of this method of propaganda was in public rhetoric.²⁵⁷ Scholarios’ translation of Aristotle’s work on logic is a direct reflection of the on-going need for dialogue with all foreign powers, Latins and especially with the Mohammedan Ottoman Turks, but also aligned elements contra to the imperial and ecclesiastical authorities.

The necessary cognitive deliberations with pagans and Ottoman Turks could not take place without the use of dialectic reasoning. Scholarios followed the dictates of Aquinas in applying the statement that with Mohammedans and pagans the only common authoritative text one could have recourse to be natural reasoning. This is a common factor in Scholarios’ reasoning following his initial studies in philosophy, when he began to study Aristotle more intently in the newly translated work by Arab commentators on Aristotle, namely Averroes and Avicenna.²⁵⁸ There is a twofold reason for this study, therefore, one towards foreign affairs and the other towards

²⁵⁴ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 54–55, 61, 63, 69.

²⁵⁵ Ibid. 60, 63, 65.

²⁵⁶ Ibid. 98.

²⁵⁷ Ibid. 104.

²⁵⁸ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle’, vol.VII. 2–3.

domestic affairs, which is reflected in Plethon's insistence that the views about re-paganism of Plato and Aristotle were imposed by religious orthodoxy and academic Aristotelianism, and ran contra to his own interpretations. Plethon's view is to be understood in the context of views about the re-paganism of social and political structures of his day, since this problem is entwined in the domestic affairs of the Byzantine Empire. These were problems Scholarios sought to resolve.²⁵⁹

3.5 Philosophical Significance

To meet the necessity of debating with the Latins, flexibility along the theological spectrum was indispensable. Although he claimed to be an ardent admirer of Aquinas, Scholarios did not adhere solely to Aquinas' theological speculations, but also remained open to Augustine and to other Western Church Fathers.²⁶⁰ This would have further ramifications, as the Western church defined its theological terminologies using Augustine's theological affirmations, which were articulated by neo-Platonist philosophical speculations. Scholarios adhered specifically to Duns Scotus's theological speculations on the subject of the Immaculate Conception; in the fifteenth century a doctrine yet to be accepted by the Roman Church.²⁶¹ Plethon's allegations concerning

²⁵⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the Grand Duke Luc Notaras (1451-1452)', [Au grand duc Luc Notaras (1451-1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 493; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 74.

²⁶⁰ Scholarios, 'Divine Predestination', vol.I.423; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 107. It seems that Scholarios was equally as influenced by Augustine's theological speculations on Thomas Aquinas as that of the entire West, who regarded the theological conclusions of this eminent Western theologian with high esteem; Robert Ombres, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* vol.35, no1, January, (1984), 2.

²⁶¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 27. Livanos provides extensive coverage of Scholarios' sources pertaining to Augustine and to the Church Fathers, pre and post period, which would demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Platonic, neo-Platonist and Aristotelian philosophical terminologies. See the comment by Petit in volume VII. Intro .p.vi of Scholarios' works: "It is in the Laurentianus Plut. 86, 19, of which the description is already given in the introduction to volume VI, that these marginal notes accompany the text of the physics of Aristotle, hand copied by Scholarios. They reference certain passages of the first three books".

Scholarios' lack of both Platonic and Aristotelian philosophical knowledge can be discounted, as in fact Scholarios reflects a general knowledge of these philosophies.²⁶²

Scholarios' correspondence on the necessity for aid for Constantinople mentions the arguments and ideology of "the Latins" numerous times.²⁶³ Naming the Latins implies the importance of the presence of the Latins at the imperial court and in Constantinople, and thus the need to address the concerns that were pertinent to them.²⁶⁴

Nevertheless, this was not the sole problem, as specified in the re-calibration of pagan Platonism by Plethon.²⁶⁵ The endeavour of Plethon to extricate all Christian interpolations from the commentaries on Plato and Aristotle's philosophy, where he considered such commentaries had misinterpreted these philosophies, was one of the fundamental differences of opinion with Scholarios, and was reflected in Plethon's *Memoranda and Law*.²⁶⁶

The principal topic of Aristotle's *Physics* is the study of being. Volume VIII of Scholarios' works dedicates a section to Aristotelian *Physics*; precisely ninety-one pages on the subject, with the title, 'The Translation of the Commentaries of Thomas Aquinas on the Physico Auditio of Aristotle', which elucidates the Christian concept of

²⁶² Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 159, 166; Scholarios, Vol.IV. Intro.,iii, vii and Vol. VIII., iv; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 184: Scholarios' desire to gain more depth to his knowledge of discourse and conviction was motivated by the need to refine his approach to presenting opinions, which was imperative for the imperial authority's political aims. Philosophy and theology were crucial factors that were prominent in the political aspirations of both Latins within the Roman Church and the imperial authority of Constantinople, since the core concern was to confront the growing menace of deviating observance, and the Ottoman Turks both politically and commercially.

²⁶³ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 69.

²⁶⁴ Scholarios, 'On the Need to Rescue Constantinople', [Sur la nécessité de secourir Constantinople], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 296.

²⁶⁵ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 72.

²⁶⁶ Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, .250. Scholarios tacitly recognizes the possibility that Aristotle leaves himself open to misinterpretation, but this does not justify Plethon's specific criticism.

the quidditative knowledge of God.²⁶⁷ Scholarios distinguishes various points of dissent between Plato and Aristotle in his annotations on the key themes: confusion of all the disciplines,²⁶⁸ first principal of the universe²⁶⁹ and also the source of creation.²⁷⁰

Scholarios quotes passages from the *Physics* and the *Metaphysics* to endorse his view that Aristotle's philosophical terminologies are consistent with Christianity. This is a focal issue of contention, since Plethon alleges Aristotle's thinking inclines towards atheism, which causes him to deny Aristotle can be seen as consistent with Christian revelation.²⁷¹ Plethon's schema is reflected in his Theory of Forms, which was to be the basis of his own neo-pagan mythology, and his re-calibration of paganism, as he asserts in his *Memoranda* and *Laws*.²⁷²

To add to the above, Volume VII of Scholarios' work contains commentaries, summaries and annotations, and simple marginal grades on the topic of Aristotle's *Physics*. The commentaries on logic comprise the largest part of the volume, being three hundred and forty-eight pages in length. In addition, there is a long epistle dedicated to the despot Constantine, later to be the last Christian Emperor of Constantinople. The

²⁶⁷ Scholarios, 'Translation of the comment by S. Thomas D'Aquin, 'of physical hearers' of Aristotle', [Traduction du commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin du, 'De physico auditu'd' Aristote], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VIII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 163–254; William L.Rowe, Willaim J.Wainwright, *Philosophy of Religion*.Selected Readings.2nd edition.(Olanda Florida USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich,Publishers.1989/1973), 9,33,59,79.

²⁶⁸ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 16; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 244.

²⁶⁹ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 10; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, .242.

²⁷⁰ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 38; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 249; Rowe, *Philosophy of religion*, 128.

²⁷¹ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 24; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 246; George Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption*. vol. 3. (Belmont MA: Nordland Publishing Company.1976), 115.

²⁷² Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 72; Kazhdan, 'George Gemistos Plethon', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 1685.

work also introduces Porphyry's *'Isagoge'*, but the greater part concentrates on Aristotle's writing on logic.²⁷³

Logic, for Aristotle, is the means by which we can perform accurate pre-meditated manoeuvres to represent the true nature of reality, because logic is an agency that transmits the clearest understanding of reality. Cognition, cognitive language and reality all have the same form, relationship and close connection, if we are able to claim understanding of reality.²⁷⁴ In the presentation of his argument on logic, Aristotle put forward formal rules for correct reasoning of the basic principles of categorical logic, rules to which Thomas Aquinas and Scholarios adhered faithfully in their respective presentations of their proposals of philosophy, and emulated in their representations of Aristotle's work. The section in Scholarios' works titled, 'The Happiness of Man according to Aristotle and Plotinus', wholly emulates Aristotle in discussion of how man is to behave in society, for the rest of the title states: '*a conciliation essay*'.²⁷⁵

Scholarios commences one of his major works dedicated to Porphyry's commentaries on Aristotle, entitled, '*How Philosophy is Useful or Serviceable*'. He provides commentaries on Porphyry's explanation of didactic literature (isagogic). Although a neo-Platonist, Porphyry attempted to explain Platonism in terms that some had attempted to express but without success, namely through the explanation of

²⁷³ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VII. i, ii. The precise date is not provided; however, as Scholarios has said that it was the first important work published on philosophy and he presented it in a lesson to the small group of students who were able to gather around his chair, we can roughly estimate that the date was somewhere between 1432 and 1435. Petit states that Scholarios was in the flower of his youth when he was teaching philosophy; this is somewhat incorrect, if Scholarios claimed to have been born in 1400, that would put him in his early thirties to thirty-five.

²⁷⁴ Ibid. For comments by Petit, see iii; Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-The three first parts of logic', [Sur les trois premières parties de la logique], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 1. A noted component of the work is the dedicatory epistle to Constantin Paleologue [Épître dédicatoire à Constantin Paléologue].

²⁷⁵ Scholarios, 'Marginal Notes on the Physics of Aristotle', [Notes marginales sur la physique d'Aristote], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VII. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 499.

Aristotelian categories and definitions *per genes et differentiam*. It seems unlikely this work was randomly selected by Scholarios; he chooses a neo-Platonist, Porphyry who is advocating the attributes of Plotinian metaphysics in his ‘*Isagoge*’, and using Aristotelian logic rather than neo-Platonism or Platonism. It seems that Scholarios’ decision to comment on Porphyry is an apologia intentionally elevating Aristotelian logic over Platonism.²⁷⁶

The allegation of exaggerated realism in Plato’s philosophy is noted by Scholarios. Additionally, the view that reality must possess the attributes of necessity, emphasizing the universality, unity and immutability that are found in our intellectual representations, is defined in Scholarios’ ‘Explication of the Five Universalities’.²⁷⁷ Having committed himself to commentaries on Aristotelian logic and subsequently on Aristotle’s ‘*Categories*’, Scholarios follows the rhetorical demands set by Aristotle in his logic. It can be argued that Scholarios’ ‘*Commentaries*’ on Porphyry confirm his very selective approach, and are intricately connected to his polemic against Gemistos Plethon and other like-minded individuals.²⁷⁸

Likewise, Scholarios’ repeated reference to people in the New Testament would indicate the theological reasons for this commentary.²⁷⁹ On the subject of Porphyry’s topic of ‘*Species*’, he annotates the text with the viewpoint that Aristotle formulated, namely emphasising the political significance.²⁸⁰ Nor has he forgotten about other

²⁷⁶ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-Isagoge of Porphyrios’, vol. VII. 50. Aristotle viewed Plato’s directive principles of his realism as exaggerated and developed a primary formula of moderate realism. See 238–348; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 71.

²⁷⁷ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-Isagoge of Porphyrios’, vol. VII.41.

²⁷⁸ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol. IV. 1v8; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 73. Long before the anti-Palamites and Plethon, Psellos first reactivates the philosophical rather than rhetorical uses of Platonic tenets, re-ascribing to pagan philosophy a semi-autonomous intellectual significance and contemporary value.

²⁷⁹ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-Isagoge of Porphyrios’ vol. VII.56.

²⁸⁰ Scholarios, ‘Doctrine of Saint Augustine’ [Doctrin de Saint Augustin], vol. II. 57–64.

philosophical terminologies; when he refers to Augustine, Duns Scotus, he is indirectly indicating his knowledge of the philosophies of neo-Platonism and nominalism.²⁸¹

Scholarios employed an extensive amount of Aristotle's work in developing his own ideas. As Petit explains in the introduction to Volume VII, the summaries and annotations of Scholarios' works, which can be seen as beginning with Book VI, "recollect the text of four books of *De caelo*, three books of *De anima*, but also the booklets, *Memoria* and *Reminiscentia* – *somno* and *viglia* – *insomniis* – *divinatione per somnum* – motion of *senectute-juventute* – of *respiratione animalium* and specifically the meteorological, are also briefly summarized".²⁸² The utilization of Aristotle and Aquinas' reflective work on Aristotle in Scholarios' summaries and annotations suggests a more than general knowledge of, and interest in, these two individuals. Even though the philosophical definitions themselves are not Scholarios' own, they have certainly been transliterated by him, and show his familiarity with the terms and texts in question.

The dedicatory section prior to the work on '*De ente et essentia*', which contains the homage to Thomas Aquinas, but also acknowledges the theories of the Franciscan and Dominican schools on theology as well as those of Aquinas, establishes Scholarios' knowledge of Western theology.²⁸³ However, more specifically it indicates Scholarios'

²⁸¹ Additional Aristotelian philosophical inquiries into whether realities exist outside the individual's senses, or are realized in the latter, and if they are things apart from the mind, whether they are corporeal or incorporeal things, are reaffirmed by Scholarios in his volume VII in the Summary division of the five first books of Aristotle. The implication of these inquiries can only reside in the need to affirm the Orthodox Christian theological doctrine of one God. Great scholastics of the late period such as Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus advanced the theme of the moderate realism of universal and are thus in accord with Averroes and Avicenna, whose works had recently passed into circulation by means of translation. Consequently, Thomas Aquinas can be said to formulate the theory of moderate realism, which came to be known as Thomistic realism.

²⁸² Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VII. i.

²⁸³ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. This is introduction by Petit on Scholarios work in the translation and commentaries of Thomas Aquinas work, whereas the above footnote is an introduction to the philosophical works of Aristotle.vi–vii; Robin Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews in the Medieval Crown*

awareness of Platonic as well as Aristotelian philosophies. This suggests Scholarios' works are really very much influenced by the philosophies, whether Aristotelian, Platonic or neo-Platonic. The articulation of Augustinian theological speculations could not be observed, if there was not the understanding of Plato and neoplatonic philosophical thought, since Augustine utilized these philosophical ideas to articulate his own theological/political conciliation.

What Scholarios sought in these studies was to contest Plethon's assertions about the Christian appropriation of Platonic philosophy, and implications concerning the recalibration of pagan Platonism.²⁸⁴ Plethon also constantly suggests Aristotelianism was not compatible with Christian faith.²⁸⁵ Scholarios sought to find a method that would promote and advance the diverse teachings he had assimilated, not only with the Latins or Mohammedans Turks, but also with pagan elements that were propagated in Constantinople and elsewhere within the Empire.²⁸⁶

In Thomas Aquinas' theological work, '*Summa Theologiae*' Aquinas endeavoured to use Aristotle's philosophical method to prove the doctrine of the Trinity. More specifically, Aquinas sought to prove the belief about the creation of man in the image of God, about which Jaroslav Pelikan states: "In clear recognition of these connections, Thomas Aquinas, in the very first question of the '*Summa Theologiae*', stated the entire rationale for the use of proofs as a theological enterprise, as distinct from his

of Aragon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Chapter 1, 21; See Fisher, *Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation*. 95-96, as noted above, in the constant contact with Latin monasteries in Constantinople, there would be an incentive also for Scholarios to advance his studies in Latin literature, as did Holobolos and Planoudes before him, being dependent on these religious Latin establishments.

²⁸⁴ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 72.

²⁸⁵ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 264.

²⁸⁶ Scholarios imitated in full the elucidation method prescribed by the Latins. He did not want to flaunt scholarship, but he stated 'I am the first to follow this method', indicating his conviction about this course of studies. See above footnotes pertaining to Petit's observation concerning the reason for Scholarios' studies. See: Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. vii-viii.

clarifications elsewhere, for example in his commentaries on Aristotle, of the philosophical significance of such proofs”.²⁸⁷

Clarifying theological doctrine using philosophical terminologies was justified by Thomas Aquinas in his statement that, “Grace does not abolish nature but completes it”.²⁸⁸ Through his study of the theological speculations of Aquinas, Scholarios was introduced to the rational method of Aristotelian philosophy, through the dialectic reasoning of inference. A prime example can be seen in Scholarios’ response to the truth that is Christianity.²⁸⁹

This method of dialectic reasoning had a particular motive that warranted further attention. Scholasticism, encased in the parameters of Aquinas’ theological speculations, together with Aristotle’s philosophical dialectical reasoning, was initiated and utilized by the Latins in their dialogues with the Byzantines and therefore had to be adopted by Scholarios to be able to respond to the Latins²⁹⁰ and subsequently to the Ottoman Turks.²⁹¹

Aquinas’ ‘*Commentaries*’ on Aristotle’s works, further commented on by Scholarios, provide a direct indication of the reason for the choice of philosophy as an area of

²⁸⁷ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol 3. The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300) (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1978), 285.

²⁸⁸ Scholarios, Volumes V, VI. In these two volumes of Work by Scholarios consist of the two *Summae* and *De Anima* which are strategically important, particularly in the dialectic reasoning of inference these were meant for, which would designate not only towards the Latins but also towards the unbaptized, since these works were completed after the capture of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks; Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 41.

²⁸⁹ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol. IV.5; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 430.

²⁹⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 105.

²⁹¹ Dimitrios Kydonis’ translation of Thomas Aquinas’ works emphatically stipulates the political dimension. This is noted by Kianka in her dissertation on Kydonis, and also endorsed by Siniosoglou in his recent work on Plethon. See: Kianka, *Demetrius Cydonis*, 93; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 369.

study.²⁹² Scholarios writes he undertakes this work “*with love for the commentaries on Aristotle by Aquinas*”,²⁹³ depicting his admiration and love for both Aristotle and Aquinas, for Scholarios considered ‘Aristotle the greatest of ancient philosophers and the one most compatible with Christian doctrine’.²⁹⁴

3.6 Scholarios as a Philosopher

The style of rhetoric under the guidelines of Aristotelian philosophical discipline is Scholarios’ criterion for clarity. This emphasizes that Scholarios was not “learning philosophy for philosophy”,—as a means for philosophical innovation—but as political orthodoxy.²⁹⁵ This allowed the acceptance of Aristotelianism, provided it was in the service of the imperial state and Christian Orthodoxy.²⁹⁶

This could warrant the questions about whether Scholarios was actually a philosopher in his own right, and to what extent he would have been accredited as a philosopher. Although he strongly advocated Aristotelianism and observed the disciplines of rhetoric as a tool of persuasion, he did not adhere to Aristotelian philosophy in the Western Tradition, as a school of intellectual movement and philosophical innovations.

Petit's summaries and annotations of Scholarios’ philosophical works have one strongly emphasised point about Scholarios’ views, particularly when the theological works

²⁹² Scholarios, ‘Translation and Commentaries-Resume of the Summary against the Gentiles of Thomas Aquinas’, [Traduction et commentaires- Résumé de la Somme contre les Gentils de saint Thomas d’Auin], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.V. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1931), 2, 2–6. There is interchange of the use of the Latin verses French in all Thomas Aquinas works. Petit utilizes the French form where in the thesis it ascribes to the Latin form, referring to Summe or Somme and so forth.

²⁹³ Scholarios, ‘Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle-On the First Three Parts of the Logic’, [Sur les trois premières parties de la logique], vol.VII. 2v29–34.

²⁹⁴ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 71.

²⁹⁵ Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 18.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. 29, 38, 42.

reflected philosophical terminologies: ²⁹⁷ that it is necessary to use philosophy to advance political ideology. Scholarios “believed it would be useful to start his comments on Aristotle with the books pertaining to logic, as it was the key instrument for a good philosopher”.²⁹⁸

Scholarios’ interest in continued study was to enable him to address the different groups of varying philosophical and theological beliefs. Unity of beliefs solidified political unity and the security of the state, which the state, Latin or Byzantine, desired; this was a paramount policy of the West-Roman Church and the imperial authority in Constantinople.

Aquinas’ *Summa contra gentiles*, written to confront Mohammedans/Jews with their errors, and also the errors committed by schismatic—as perceived by the Latins—Byzantine Greeks, has a political motive, even though it is theological in content. Scholarios’ work in defence of Aristotle against Plethon, directs his work to one issue: the ability of Aristotle’s philosophy to clarify Christianity and the political perceptions of the future of the Byzantine State.²⁹⁹

Scholarios devoted part of volume V to translating and commenting Aquinas’ works *Summa contra gentiles* and *Summa theologiae* and clearly demonstrates his familiarity with Aristotle’s philosophical terminologies, but also clearly demonstrates Scholarios’ utilization of Aquinas’ work for the dialectic reasoning with Ottoman Turks, since it was commented and summarized in the period of the Ottoman control of

²⁹⁷ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VII. ii. See the annotations in the section of this chapter.

²⁹⁸ (Author’s translation of Petit’s comment on Scholarios.) See Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VII. iii.

²⁹⁹ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol.IV. 1; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 430–1. Since Scholarios used the name George instead of Gennadios, this particular work of Scholarios was written prior to entering the monastic life and he addresses the work to Despot Constantine before his succession to the throne. This would indicate that Scholarios wrote this work between 1444 and 1445, as indicated by Turner.

Constantinople. The study of Aristotelian philosophy was not limited to the processes of the Byzantines' political dialogue with the Latins; the observations in the study of the '*Summa contra gentiles*' would further indicate the necessity for the study of Aristotle, particularly the disciplines of logic, physics and rhetoric for dialectic reasoning, as Aquinas' work is directly addressed to those who hold other opinions.³⁰⁰

Although Turner does not fully explain how philosophical and theological subjects actually work as tools of political persuasion, he does acknowledge that Scholarios strongly emphasized that the teaching of Aristotelian philosophy was to go beyond the norm that was adhered to by the Byzantine authorities, to include or embrace also the Thomistic assimilation of the philosophical terminologies of Aristotle into a Christian synthesis.³⁰¹ Turner continues by stating that Scholarios desired the cultural heritage of Byzantium, which strongly implies expanding the theological subjects to include the fruits of Latin Scholarship.³⁰² The statement about the inclusion of the fruits of Latin scholarship would imply the use of Aristotelian philosophy as an explanatory tool in the implementation of Thomist theological arguments that the Latins were stipulating, primarily against heretical opinions and theological beliefs.³⁰³

Scholarios' constant admiration for Aristotle, and in turn also for Aquinas, did not diminish throughout his life. His defence of Aristotle in his letter to Plethon written five years after the Council of Florence strongly emphasizes the importance of philosophy as

³⁰⁰ Scholarios, 'Letter to Gemistos Plethon about his Book against the Latins', [Lettre à Gemistos Plethon à propos de son ouvrage contre les Latins], (1450), in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 118,142; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 125–160; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 71–94. See the section on the political views for the future of the Byzantine State.

³⁰¹ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 1-189; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 430.

³⁰² Aristeides Papadakis, 'Gennadius II and Mehmet the Conqueror', *Byzantine* 42 (1972):89-90; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 430.

³⁰³ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol. IV.10.

a dialectical tool. There would be no need to convene the Council of Florence if the theological dogmas were in unison between the churches of East and West. Nor would the demand for the union of the churches be made, or the request for political aid, or conditions implied to emphasize the prime subject of union of the churches was required, before any assistance in military aid would be given to the Byzantine imperial authorities, if the union was a reality. It was this political directive that was paramount and was the directive force for Scholarios' need for further studies in Aristotelian philosophy, which he strongly emphasizes in his work for further studies of the fruits of Latin scholarship.³⁰⁴ Scholarios' *Defence of Aristotle* directly indicates the use of philosophy as a vehicle for the theological clarification of ecclesiastical and political policy.³⁰⁵ Even though it was claimed the work was written in 1444–5,³⁰⁶ it is generally directed against Plethon; the main emphasis is on how both Scholarios and Plethon were to view the political future of the Byzantine State.³⁰⁷

What can be seen in this observation of Scholarios' philosophical studies, as Livanos points out, is that Scholarios was not originally interested in the theological speculations of Aquinas. Only later, after the Council of Florence, did he begin to show any interest in the theological differences between East and West. When major works of Aquinas were initially being re-translated and commented by Scholarios, the Ottoman Turks had all but encircled the imperial city of Constantinople, which was confirmed by Syropoulos in his '*Mémoires*' on the deliberations of the Council of Florence.³⁰⁸

³⁰⁴ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 112, 116; Barbour, *Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 18.

³⁰⁵ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 1-23. See: 2 v 25, 5 v15.

³⁰⁶ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 430.

³⁰⁷ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 75; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 347; Niketas Siniosoglou, *Plato and Theodoret: The Christian Appropriation of Platonic Philosophy and the Hellenic Intellectual Resistance*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 238-239.

³⁰⁸ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 396.

This reaffirms the point that Scholarios' interest in theology is a later motivation for this study. This indicates that the interest in Aristotle was not governed primarily by the interest in theology nor philosophy, but the priority was to use philosophy as a vehicle for the expression of Byzantine political thought. As Angelov indicates,³⁰⁹ to interpret any work (particularly in this case of Scholarios) as a genuinely philosophical or theological writings without acknowledging the political motivations that govern the studies themselves, is to separate the writings from their political reality. The various attempts to initiate Union, as is shown by the voluntary actions of the Latins, demonstrate this political factor: "And the Latins themselves showed this desire, for they wanted with us the desired Union". Emphasizing that the Latins desired the Union demonstrates the importance of this Union between Latins and Byzantines because of what the Union will enhance, as Scholarios states in his correspondence.³¹⁰

Scholarios' sermons and homilies confirm the distinct function of court oratory. But, it has been argued, the imperial panegyrics never had a really extensive reach as propaganda, since the recipients of rhetorical addresses were restricted to the state imperial bureaucracy, and therefore were preached to the converted, including the Emperor himself.³¹¹ But this was not necessarily the case, as Scholarios' sermons, letters and panegyrics draw attention to the important political issues camouflaged within the theology, as Angelov suggests, and attempt to convert the unconverted listeners to his viewpoint. This was especially so once he had become anti-Unionist,

³⁰⁹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18.

³¹⁰ Scholarios, 'Oratorical Works-Sermon and Panegyric', vol. I.296, 325–372.

³¹¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 180.

which would be relevant to the Latins, Byzantine Latinophiles and to the Ottoman Turks as well.³¹²

Scholarios' work, encompassing the various genres of panegyrics, homilies, eulogies and poetry, provides examples to suggest how immersed he was in the system of imperial bureaucracy, and show how Aristotle's rhetorical and philosophical treatises were of paramount importance in the imperial court and to the political situation in Constantinople.³¹³

Plethon's work '*De Differentiis*' motivates Scholarios to respond in his '*Defence of Aristotle*'. The implications of this exchange are to be found within the political question of how each saw the future of the imperial Byzantine state, and the best way to bring about this future. This difference of vision generated an aggressive campaign by both individuals with the use of philosophical, theological terminologies to promote their political perspectives.³¹⁴

³¹² Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 362; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 391; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 225.

³¹³ Scholarios, 'Oratorical Works-Sermon and Panegyric', vol. I. 296.

³¹⁴ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 21, 75. Scholarios' reason of choice concerning the two philosophies was that Aristotle was more compatible with Christianity than Plato.

CHAPTER FOUR – SCHOLARIOS AS A THEOLOGIAN

4.1 Theological Studies

I have claimed Scholarios is an enthusiastic follower of the theological speculations of Thomas Aquinas. In the initial investigations of this chapter, beginning with the research into Scholarios' motives for this interest, I shall refer to Hugh Barbour's attempts to clarify what a Byzantine Thomist is. I will consider the validity of Scholarios' theological credibility and again argue that his work in this context is not solely an exercise in gaining further theological awareness, but must have a political impetus.

Scholarios was not primarily concerned with the totality of Aquinas' works, but specifically only with those that underline the prime importance of his political ecclesiastical agenda. Scholarios' commentaries on Aquinas show he remains within the confines of certain themes and does not comment on the wider scope. The major works of Aquinas notated are: '*On the Being and Essence*' ('*De ente et essentia*') (c.1252–56), '*Commentary on the Sentences*' (1254–56), '*De veritate*' (1256–59), '*Commentary on the Divine Names*' (1261), the '*Summa contra gentiles*' (1259–64), '*De potentia*' (1265–66), and the '*Summa theologiae*' (1265–73). These works were of interest to Scholarios as well as Aquinas' commentary on Aristotle's '*De anima*' ['*On the Soul*'] (In libros '*De anima*' exposition) of 1268.³¹⁵

³¹⁵ David Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 242.

Of these above, Aquinas' work that was to be of paramount significance to Scholarios was '*On Being and Essence*'. It is one of the principal works that Scholarios incorporates most prominently in his writings. There are some doubts whether Scholarios translated '*De anima*' titled Περὶ Ψυχῆς in his work during the period from 1445 until after his first term as Patriarchate in 1456, but the major emphasis in the discussion that follows will rest on the reasons for Scholarios' need to correct and summarize this text.

Testimonies to Scholarios as an excellent Aristotelian philosopher and theological scholar imply that the reputation attributed to him is correct. Scholars in this field of study have applied this appellation to him even in recent years.³¹⁶ Although Scholarios is seen as an excellent theologian, there are some critics who have reservations, which stem from specific definitions of the term Byzantine Thomism. These are articulated in Barbour's presentation of evidence to justify his use of the term.³¹⁷ An example of one of the reasons for Barbour's conclusions is the apparent inability of the Byzantines to accept the theological reasoning credited in the repudiation of the Universal Roman Magisterium, and advocated by Thomas Aquinas.³¹⁸ Its deployment is selective and derogatory, determined by theological dogma as perceived by the Roman Church. Thus

³¹⁶ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 19. Citing: "Jaroslav Pelikan has written there was probably no such apology over and against Islam that succeeded more fully than the treatise *Concerning the Only Way for the Salvation of men*, written by the Aristotelian philosopher and theological scholar, George Scholarios"; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 2. 'The Spirit of Eastern Christendom' (600-1700) (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1974), 242; Timothy Ware, *Orthodox Church* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: PenguinBooks, 1963), 211; Scholarios, 'Apologetic Writings addressed to the Mohamedans-The only way of salvation', [*Écrits apologétiques à l'adresse des Musulmans-L'unique voie du salut*], in (*Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 434-452.

³¹⁷ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 38. Barbour suggests the restrictive theology of the Byzantines accounts for a degree of rigidity in the comprehension of theological terminologies of Thomas Aquinas.

³¹⁸ Ibid. 39.

it pertains to the unqualified acceptance of Scholarios as a true Thomist and theologian, as long as it is in the service of Christian Orthodoxy.³¹⁹

Apostolos Karpozilos attests to the fact that a Thomistic circle of devotees had been established at the imperial palace in Constantinople. These were especially active after the translation of Aquinas' works by Dimitrios Kydonis in 1354-55, his theological speculations and subsequently his commentaries on Aristotle.³²⁰ Karpozilos comments, 'this pro-Latin movement during the fourteenth century exerted a great influence on Byzantine thought and extended its effect to many Orthodox intellectuals.' Barbour notes moreover that it was fashionable to be a Thomist at the imperial court.³²¹

4.2 Application of Thomistic Theology in Scholarios' Works

The use of the science of Aristotelian philosophy in the context of Aquinas' speculative theology, which allows him to put forward the argument that knowledge of God could be arrived at through reasoning, would have appeared baffling to the Orthodox East, since this perspective would have suggested intimate knowledge of God— an illogical and abhorrent position in the view of the Byzantines. This point is noted by Karpozilos: "To claim that it is a science in the Aristotelian sense—one that has God as its subject matter—would have struck the Byzantines as strangely pretentious. For them, God can be known only through practice."³²² In the Orthodox East, the practice of the mysteries (that is, the sacraments in Western terminology) together with the ardent practice of

³¹⁹ Ibid. 29.

³²⁰ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 91-92.

³²¹ Karpozilos, *St Thomas Aquinas and the Byzantine East*, 129; Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 13.

³²² Karpozilos, *St Thomas Aquinas and the Byzantine East*, 13; Robert E. Sienkewicz, 'The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian', *Mediaeval Studies*, 44, (1982): 182-242. See: 215 dialectic argument on Balaam's criticism of Aquinas' Aristotelianism.

prayer, fasting and meditation are perceived as the only conduits to knowledge of God. It is not unexpected to find, therefore, that the traditional approach to Eastern theology—apophaticism—is considered by the West as the root cause of the division, when it is mistakenly read as a formative approach to theology, and considered mystical, and opposed to reason. Thus, from a Western perspective, it is perceived as conservative (or ‘traditional’ in a perjorative sense) by some authors in the field of study.³²³

The Hesychast controversy of the early and middle parts of the fourteenth century had become a clear indictment of the apophaticist tradition by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, due to the growing influence of Western theology and the emergence of secular ways of thinking. As a consequence of this trend, “the Byzantines were repeatedly challenged by the Latins to clarify their position with regard to fundamental issues of Eastern Orthodox dogma that concerned, intriguingly, the outcome of the Hesychast controversy”.³²⁴ The Eastern theological tradition of apophaticism had to defend its principles against the allegations of a lack of clarity from the West.³²⁵ Sinossoglou writes in relation to Scholarios: “At times even Scholarios was forced to suppress his Thomist sympathies in favour of Palamite Orthodoxy”.³²⁶

The remarks of David Bradshaw reflect this view: “the Byzantines took for granted that what had been said by the Fathers was correct and complete, and they saw their own task as that of applying this inherited wisdom to the issues at hand”.³²⁷ However, Aquinas’ ability to simplify the practical approach to philosophy appealed to

³²³ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 221; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 249.

³²⁴ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 118.

³²⁵ Ibid. 118-119.

³²⁶ Ibid. 117.

³²⁷ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 221.

Scholarios, and to selected fellow Byzantines. This would subsequently motivate Scholarios to study the theological speculations of Aquinas further, particularly when Aristotelianism was commensurate with the Christian revelation explanation of theological doctrine.³²⁸ Subsequently, when Aquinas' theological speculations reflect the apophaticist tradition of the East, one concludes that Scholarios was not only motivated by their simplicity but also because Aquinas' arguments were consistent with the theological tradition of the Orthodox East.³²⁹

The fact that the imperial tradition was advocating the use of Aristotelian rhetoric would further explain why Scholarios was drawn to Aquinas. Through his interest in Aquinas, Scholarios hoped to articulate the relevant theological themes. Prior and during the period of his political service with the imperial authority Dimitrios Kydonis started to translate the major works of Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles* and *Summa theologiae*.³³⁰ Kianka writes: 'Dimitrios' most uninterrupted period of government service during the reign of John V (c.1355-72) was marked by a consistent Byzantine policy of attempted resistance to Turkish aggression and seeking of allies among the Latins in Western Europe and in the Levant.'³³¹ The political tumult at this time would be reflected in Scholarios' works in 1430 and up to the period as Patriarch in 1465 (when Scholarios was re-translating and commenting on Kydonis' translated works of Aquinas' *Summae*) and in the latter part of his life, when developing policy to thwart the political influence of the Turks was paramount.

³²⁸ Livanos, *Greek Traditions and Latin Influence*, 21.

³²⁹ Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence-To Matthew Kamariotis', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VI. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), 178. Scholarios emphasized his commitment to Aquinas by praising him to his student Matthew Kamariotis; Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 243.

³³⁰ Mercati, 'Information of Procoros and Dimitrios Kydonis', 102-103.

³³¹ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 225.

Scholarios' treatise, a Christian apology for a Turkish audience, is entitled '*Demands and responses on the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ concerning the Only Way for the Salvation of Men*' (1470). It is regarded as an acceptable Christian apology by an Aristotelian philosopher and theological scholar in response to an inquiry into the validity of the Christian faith.³³² The treatise is a political endeavour to expurgate theological differences by finding commonality between the two religions. The mere fact that the treatise was presented before Mohammedan scholars in the presence of the Conqueror of Constantinople, who was seen as head of their faith, suggests a political motive rather than an increased attempt to convert them to the Christian faith.³³³ Even though conversion was desired, it could not be achieved, especially after the Ottoman conquest of the Byzantine Empire. It seems this text really expresses a political agenda, rather than any romantic illusion of conversion.³³⁴

4.3Aristotelianism versus Hesychasm

Other than Nikephoros the Hesychast, cited as the initiator of this movement towards Hesychasm, there was an additional prime mover behind this mystical experience and to whom Palamas credits the initiation of Hesychasm, namely Theoleptos of Philadelphia, who was introduced in the above section. A spiritual adviser too many in the Eastern Roman Empire, Theoleptos, the Metropolitan of Philadelphia, was an intensely spiritual

³³² Scholarios, 'Introduction' vol.III.xlii-xlv. When the work was written it was seventeen years after the Ottoman conquered Constantinople, and this was the principle political agenda.

³³³ Scholarios, 'Requests and Responses on the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ (1470)', [*Demandes et réponses sur la divinité de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ (1470)* in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 468, 15–16, 475, 3–19; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 446.

³³⁴ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 84. It is apparent that the pastoral letter, dated 1455, immediately demonstrates a political affiliation in the noting of the 'fatherland, that of the Greek nation', even though it is in a theological context.³³⁴ Turner surmises the political agenda of the Byzantines before the Council was to meet in 1438–9. Both observations point to a political agenda in all communications with Latins and Ottoman Turks.

man who influenced Gregory Palamas as well as immediate members of his family, and even many of the aristocracy.³³⁵ Theoleptos, together with the formidable Patriarch Athanasios I, motivated many reforms in monastic communities through contemplation and spiritual exercises. In turn, the need for contemplation, good works and regular liturgical practices were propagated to the general public. The effect was to draw the general public towards spiritual renewal and to the individuals themselves who were doing the propagating. Inspired and influenced by Nikephoros and Gregory of Sinai with respect to the traditions of the spiritual exercises of the monastic communities,³³⁶ Theoleptos further imparted these traditions of prayer to the general public. This is evidenced by the great influence he had on Palamas's father and Palamas himself. It is also apparent that this influence extended to the clergy as well. The method of prayer was also imparted to another future patriarch, Philotheos, who was to play a pivotal part in the nurturing of the Hesychastic movement.³³⁷

In his efforts to promote the tradition of monasticism regarding the method of prayer, Theoleptos is credited with integrating the spiritual tradition of the Eastern Church into an ecclesiastical and Christocentric framework.³³⁸ The origins of these influences are to be found in the theology of Patriarch Gregory of Cyprus and in the monastic traditions that had only recently been fostered by Nikephoros the Hesychast and Gregory the Sinaite.³³⁹ These theological perceptions became the precursors of the theological system with which Palamas constructed his debate in defence of Hesychasm and the development of the sacramental liturgical theology of Nicholas Kavalas. Theoleptos inherited from Gregory of Cyprus an astute awareness of ecclesiastical and sacramental

³³⁵ Meyendorff, *Gregory Palamas*, 28.

³³⁶ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm*, Intro.iii.

³³⁷ Meyendorff, *Gregory Palamas*, 37-39.

³³⁸ Ibid.

³³⁹ Rigo, 'Gregory of Sinai', vol. II, 37-130, especially pages 37-39.

unity and this insight resides in the theology espoused and promoted by Palamas and Kavasilas. The system of thought of Gregory of Cyprus and Theoleptos of Philadelphia, following the tradition of the Church Fathers, was reflected in Palamas, and especially in those who adhered to the precepts of their theology during the period of Eugenikos and Scholarios. One additional aspect affected the theology of Palamas and Kavasilas, and that was Thomistic theology.³⁴⁰

The immense attention to mysticism and the intense influences of monasticism coincided with a renewal of interest in the application of philosophy to religion in Constantinople.³⁴¹ Many who were motivated by philosophical speculations and by Thomistic theology were longing to flee from the limitations of apophatic theology in order to follow the West in the more cataphatic approach.³⁴² Those participating in this movement found the religious reforms, by some, to be repressive in their austerity, and were drawn to a more logical conclusion that was influenced by the pursuit of Roman and Greek literature that ultimately was termed as secular and was propagated by the West.³⁴³ For it can be assumed that the spiritual reforms motivated by Theoleptos and primarily by Patriarch Athanasios encouraged a movement towards the cataphatic approach. An additional aspect of the Latin influence, particularly the movement of humanism, can be further examined in the person of Metochitis and his relationship with his pupils Nikephoros Gregoras, Nicholas Kavasilas and Joseph Bryennios. Each of these individuals played an important role in the political and

³⁴⁰ Barrios, 'Palamism Revisited', 19, 4, 228-231; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, 178-194; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 105-109.

³⁴¹ Runciman, *The Church in Captivity*, 129.

³⁴² Meyendorff, *Byzantine Legacy*, 139-146; Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 105-106.

³⁴³ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm*, v, 61. Meyendorff points out the political and theological movements that were affecting the Eastern Roman Empire in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

philosophical/theological sphere and in the controversy of Hesychasm that emanated from Constantinople.

The events after 1204 following the siege of Constantinople, had an overwhelming impact, as which the Orthodox East found itself under imposed Latin sovereignty, and suffering forceful conversions of their faithful and their clergy to the Roman Church. The reaction to these events had negative repercussions in the consciousness of the Byzantine society. It encouraged a more visible presence of the Athonite tradition of Hesychasm and its anti-Latin legacy, from where it had its impetus, to influence Byzantine society in fourteenth century. The implications of this movement became evident in the complexities of philosophical and theological deliberations. In fact these theological/philosophical deliberations were not as pertinent to the Latins, since their interest lay in their commercial activities and their dominance in culture political sphere; however, the Byzantines were obliged to converse within the Latins' sphere of interest.

It can be suggested that the cataphatic terminology may have been the reason for Scholarios's fervent support for Thomistic Aristotelianism; however, it was also the reason for the major political problem in this period. Scholarios's approach to Thomistic Aristotelianism was an avenue, as was Kydonis's before him, for solving that political problem, that of the Ottoman Turks, by obtaining military aid from the Latins.

The inroads created by the Latins emphasize the political aggrandizement and continuous encroachment on the domains of the Empire, facilitating the growth of its own power. The interaction of cultures introduced to the East the method of philosophical and theological enlightenment that was the theoretical foundation of scholasticism. The introduction of philosophical concepts by Augustine of Hippo and

Boethius who attempted to incorporate the thoughts of Plato and Neoplatonists into clarification of Christian theological dogma were either to be assumed as the Christianization of ancient philosophical concepts or the secularization of theological dogma. But this avenue of secular learning was not solely obtained from the recent inroads of Latin encroachments but also by the eleventh century development of intellectual culture in the renaissance of Plato's pagan component, propagated by Michel Psellos. The underlying argument was that the pagan element of the classical pagan philosophies were never really expunged from intellectuals' minds, but remained within the literature, available for those who sought the clarity or wisdom of the thoughts of the ancient philosophers. The implications as to the fear of the spread of influence of secular or pagan elements can be discerned from the indicts stated in the twelfth century.

“On those who profess to be orthodox but shamelessly, or rather blasphemously, introduce into the Orthodox and Catholic Church the impious dogmas of the Hellenes about human souls, and heaven, and earth and other creatures:
Anathema!”

The dogma of the transmigration of soul's prominent concept of Plato is cited and condemned, but also all others who espouse philosophical doctrines associated with Platonism, such as eternity of the Forms or Ideas and of matter; and those who deny divine phenomena are anathematized.

“On those who pursue Hellene learning and are forms by it not simply as an educational discipline, but follow their empty opinions, and believe them to be true, and thus become involved in them, as possessing certainty, so that they

introduce others to them, whether secretly or openly, and teach them as indubitable: *Anathema!*”³⁴⁴

The observance that certain theological doctrines, such as that of Origenism, originate from Plato suggest “the condemnation was in part the recrudescence of an ancient antagonism between the heritage of classical philosophy and the tradition of the gospel.”³⁴⁵ Again this is emphasized when “Orthodox Fathers of the Church acknowledged a specific category of thought that does not denote material simulacra, in that the human intellect may be idolised as easily as any object: philosophical notions are products of human facilities just as material images are.”³⁴⁶

The “theologian should provide nothing but an ‘image of truth’. Otherwise, theology degenerates into idolatry”.³⁴⁷ There are analogous references not only to Barlaam, Akindynos, but also to Plethon, in the endeavour to substitute theological accuracy with philosophical terminology.³⁴⁸ The suggestion that the Orthodox East was backward because it never developed any Scholasticism of its own, or that it simply retired to a “theology of repetition”, is wholly inappropriate.³⁴⁹

The suggestion that the human intellect can be idolised as easily as any object is reflected in the words of Gregory Palamas: in accentuating the errors of the Greek philosophers, Palamas writes; “They are unremittingly enveloped in that wisdom, full stupidity and folly”; and, he exclaims, “they calumniate both God and nature; to nature

³⁴⁴ J. Gouillard, “Le Synodikon d’Orthodoxie: Édition et commentaire,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967):1-270, esp. 57 and 59. Also quoted by Andrew Louth, in his *Greek East and Latin West. The Church AD 681-1071* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press. 2007), 320-321. See footnote 3, Anathemas 1,3,6,7 against John Italos from the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 33.

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

³⁴⁸ Akindynos, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, 15. See at bottom of the page.

³⁴⁹ Georges Florovsky, *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*. (Belmont Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company.1972), 110.

they gave sovereignty, and deprive God of that sovereignty”. He continues aggressively “disparaging Plato and the Neo-Platonists, as also Aristotle in their arguments to demonstrate the errors of the Hellenes, but at the same time denotes specific tolerance of the self-sufficiency of scientific research in the physical field.”³⁵⁰

A prime example of Scholarios’ position in this respect can be seen in the burning of ‘*On Law*’, the book Plethon particularly associated with pagan ideology. On this point Scholarios does conform to doctrinal correctness, remaining within the bounds of Orthodox doctrine. The terminologies utilized in his work against Barlaam and Akindynos affirms Scholarios’ position as to his position towards Palamas and Hesychasm. When the terms “argumentative delusions” (plani, filoneikos), and “threatening heresies” (aipetikois apeilifotes) are directed towards Akindynos and Barlaam and, additionally, when he honours Gregory Palamas in his Canon, Scholarios reveals his true convictions. In Scholarios’ sermon for Orthodox Sunday, the first Sunday in Lent, he not only castigates John Italos, but he describes Barlaam as “babbler, nonsensical/absurd” (flinafos) and Akindynos as “dangerous” (kindynos) and “very dangerous” (πολυκίνδυνος).³⁵¹ In his decision to associate these individuals with the Sunday of Orthodoxy in order to annunciate their theological errors, Scholarios correlates past errors that affected the Church as Iconoclasm heresy, (for which the Orthodox Church celebrates her victory over this heresy on that day), with that of those

³⁵⁰ John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press. 1998), 129.

³⁵¹ Scholarios, ‘Oratorical Works-Sermons and Panegyrics’, vol I.118; Scholarios, ‘Poetic Works- Canon in Honour of Gregory Palamas’, [Conon en l’honneur de Grégoire Palamas], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 394-395; Scholarios, ‘Translation and Commentaries of the Works of Saint Thomas Aquinas: On Being and Essence’, [Τοῦ Θωμᾶ, Περὶ Διαφορᾶς Οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VI. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), 282; Akindynos, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, Second letter to Barlaam, Akindynos chastising Barlaam in his attacks on the Hesychasts, 27; Juan Nadal Canellas, ‘Gregoro Akindinos’, in *La Théologie Byzantine et sa Tradition*, vol. II, eds, Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello Vassa Conticello Contre d’études des religions du Livre. (Turnhout Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2002), 191-256. See 195-205.

above mentioned.³⁵² In this respect, Scholarios shows his hand, for in defending Gregory Palamas he defends Hesychasm; by assailing those who attacked Palamas, he is aligned with the theological tradition that recently the Orthodox Church came to accept. Further evidence of Scholarios' affiliation with Palamas can be observed in Palamas' philosophical convictions "that the idealism of Plato is in fact incompatible with the Christian conception of a living God, who cannot admit any intermediate substance between the Creator and the creatures." This argument resounds in Scholarios' own words towards Plethon.³⁵³ Yet again, Scholarios appears to re-utilize Palamas' exact phraseology on the subject of divine essences and operations, when he defines the unknowability of God.³⁵⁴ He emphasizes Palamas' assertion that 'what surpasses the demonstration of Aristotle is pointless.'

Nevertheless, the works of Aristotle were the catalyst for change, introduced by Anslem of Canterbury, Abelard, Duns Scotus and also Thomas Aquinas. This method of philosophical and theological pursuit was to be the stimulation for the growth of scholasticism and secularism.³⁵⁵ The growth of secularization under the influence of scholasticism changed the view of how to obtain a spiritual life. Those who were philosophically inclined became the purveyors of these trends and, stimulated by these influences, affected the Byzantine populace. To counterattack these influences of scholasticism and Latinism, the spiritual directives of Theoleptos and Patriarch

³⁵² Scholarios, 'Oratorical Works-Sermons and Panegyrics-Sermon for the Feast of Sunday of Orthodoxy', [Sermon pour la fête de l'Orthodoxie], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), vol I., 102-122. See.119v19. The references to the Hellenes of old, refers to the pagan heretage and the Jews having distorted wisdom and apistia (unbelieving).

³⁵³ Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, 130.

³⁵⁴ Scholarios, 'Antibarlaamite Polemic-The Divine Essence and its Operations', [Polémique antibarlaamite – Distinction entre l'essence divine et ses opérations], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 233.

³⁵⁵ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Hesychasm*, 905-914.

Athanasios became a vital force against the influences of scholasticism and Latinism, and a positive force for spiritual attainment by the Orthodox faithful.

In his work entitled *The Council of Florence*, Gill provides a synoptic explanation for the various influences that were dominating in this period. There were moderates and Rigorists, or Extremists; the former consisted mainly of politicians, the court circle and the higher clerics, that is, the bishops, who were toeing the line of what was demanded by the Emperor. The latter were made up of the monastics who advocated strong anti-Latin and anti-union opinions and who became the dominant force against the moderates in Constantinople.³⁵⁶

The crucial problem of the Hesychastic controversy was not only the doctrinal matter, but the perceptions stimulated by scholastic influences, that motivated a reaction culminating in this controversy. The cataphatic tradition of Western theology became more plausible in the understanding of theology rather than the apophatic Eastern tradition. This was due to the traditions that the West had introduced into the East and had therefore alienated, to some degree, the cultural and theological perspectives that the Eastern and Orthodox fathers had observed through the ages.

A few in the East began to view the tradition in this field as lacking in the refinement or understanding of philosophical perspectives. Kydonis held the conviction that the West had in fact become more dedicated to the study of Plato and Aristotle rather than the Byzantines who had no care for their own traditions. This implies that the West had become, through the admiration and study of the pagan philosophies, imitators and advocates of the ancient Hellenic heritage. Thus the Latin West, rather than the

³⁵⁶ Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 14.

Orthodox East, became the inheritors of that tradition that was to become known as a profane science.

Barlaam was sceptical about the power of the human intellect alone to be able to know God, but such nominalism led to an even greater exaltation of the authority of the Scripture and Church Fathers, as source of an *ex machina* revelation. Revealed writings, in his view, could not have been intended to stimulate thought, for thought could not derive the smallest corollary from a unique revelation. So the proper field for the development of the human mind must be elsewhere than in the field of theology, and his own particular interests inclined him to the study the ‘profane’ sciences.³⁵⁷

Those in Emperor John VI Kantakouzinus’ immediate circle of influence, including Kydonis, not only came under the influence of Latinism, that is, Thomistic philosophical-theological speculations, but also became anti-Palamists, due to the spread of the philosophical ideas of Aristotelianism. They shared the opposition of Nikephoros Gregoras to Palamism and Hesychasm, but they differed in their admiration of Thomistic theology. Kantakouzinus was an enthusiastic Palamist, but Kavasilas and Kydonis, who served as a secretary and friend respectively of Kantakouzinus, did not share his convictions about Palamism. Kavasilas, who was a friend not only to Kydonis, but was also, together with Kydonis, associated with the close circle of those who were intimates with Kantakouzinus, did advocate Palamism.

This synoptic account demonstrates a variety of opinions. Individuals within court openly expressed opposing views and diverse opinions when they actually were acquaintances and friends of each other. Gregoras and Kydonis did not share views: Kydonis had an admiration for Thomistic theology, but Gregoras did not, but both were

³⁵⁷ Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, 116.

anti-Palamists and had close friendships with individuals who did not oppose their point of view concerning Palamism and Hesychasm.

Divergent philosophical speculations led to divergent views of theology, and created a broad scholastic approach to the two fields. These two fields of thought not only stimulated one another, but were also directly influenced by cultural forces that were influenced by Latinization and subsequently by pro-Latin Byzantines within the court. This influence can be identified as Scholarios's source of Latinization, since Scholarios and Kydonis were both court appointees and as such both were directed by their respective emperors to the in-depth study of Aristotelian and Thomistic philosophical-theological speculations; a point that has been made in the previous chapter of this thesis. Kantakouzinus used dialogue to assure political stability in Constantinople and the Empire. Through the use of dialogue as an intellectual tool, not force, Kantakouzinus found the means to facilitate Western assistance in order to avoid any political incursion by both Latins and Turks. Strategically, the force of theological persuasion was the only effective measure for stabilizing political situations. By this means any political move by any Latin contention could be averted. The acceptance of theological agreement between Constantinople and Rome implied immediate protection by Rome, and even warranted assistance in obtaining aid from the West. It was in this context that Kantakouzinus utilized the interest in theological dialogue to enhance the aid that was needed and at the same time bring about the genuine desire of union by both churches.³⁵⁸

³⁵⁸ Gerhard Podskalsky, 'Theology and philosophy in Byzantium: the controversy over the theological methodology in the Late Byzantine history', [Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: Der Streit um die Theologische Methodik in der Spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte] (14th-15th century), its Systematic foundations and its historical development, Byzantine archive, folder 15, (Munich: Berk'sche, 1977), 156-158.

This tradition of inquiry and dialogue by the East was not a novelty but was the tradition of the East from the ancient Greeks through the Roman Empire and was perpetuated by such figures as Michael Psellos, John Italos and Patriarch Photios. The course of dialogue and inquiry followed the inherited tradition that was constant and reflective not only of Photios, Psellos and Italos, but was also continuously perpetuated by like-minded scholars such as Kantakouzinios, Metochitis, Gregoras, Kydonis, Kavasilas, Bryennios and Scholarios. They are direct descendants of Psellos, Italos and Photios and inherited their traditions of investigation. They subsequently imparted traditions to later generations, especially prior to the Fall of Constantinople. Individuals such as Mark Eugenikos, Bessarion and George Scholarios inherited this Eastern tradition of dialogue in its sphere of inquiry. This subject was touched on above in reference to the rising interest in the profane sciences of Aristotelian logic to determine theological doctrines and were openly discussed and propagated in the Imperial court.³⁵⁹

The investigation of the possibility of philosophical-theological dialogue with the West presupposed all forms of knowledge, including the study of secular philosophy that adopted radically divergent opinions of the main theological options.³⁶⁰ However, this course of inquiry resulted in casualties and major mistakes in an in-depth encounter with Western theology.³⁶¹ Ultimately this led to individuals assimilating the theological options of the East, conforming to the West, or expressing diverse opinions not entertained by either East or West.

³⁵⁹ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 63; Robert Sienkewicz, 'Gregory Palamas', *La Théologie Byzantine et sa Tradition*: vol. II, eds, Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello Vassa Conticello: Contre d'études des religions du Livre. (Turnhout Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2002), 164.

³⁶⁰ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 63

³⁶¹ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 63; Meyendorff, *Gregory Palamas*, 103; Runciman, *The Church in Captivity*, 209.

The divergence in the method of arrival and conviction; Barlaam, Akindynos, Kydonis, Kavasilas, Bryennios and Kantakouzinios are examples of this. The knowledge gained prepared them for the incursions of not only the Latin West, but also of the Islamic East. In both cases, Greeks willingly converted to these faiths. The efforts to counterattack these influences only left the Empire more vulnerable and more susceptible to these growing menaces. These threats contributed to internal discord that in turn undermined the Eastern Empire. In order to counterattack and prepare the Orthodox East, knowledge of Latin theological reasoning was a prerequisite. It encompassed key features of rhetoric and Aristotelianism.

“Originally the discussion had focused on the applicability of the profane science of Aristotelian logic to the determination of theological doctrines. Very quickly, however, the discussion shifted to a consideration of the inherent value of profane learning, and even its necessity, for the attainment of Christian perfection. In the larger background there was the general renewal of interest in the philosophical and scientific works of antiquity, seen in the numerous writings on these subjects by such Byzantine literati as Nikephoros Choumnos, Theodore Metochitis Nikephoros Gregoras and Barlaam himself”.³⁶²

These speculations of philosophy in articulating theological doctrine led many to the conviction of the Latin Church, starting with Barlaam, Kydonis, Chrysoloras and Chrysobergis brothers. Two disciplines were the causes for the development of those convictions, philosophy and theology. Both were forces that led the Byzantines towards the West, implications of which have been discussed above. Philosophy and theology

³⁶² Sienkewicz, ‘Gregory Palamas’, 164

were intertwined in many cases so that the influences of theological speculation were arrived at from the premises of philosophical speculations.

It was stated above that the pursuit of philosophical learning implied that those who were influenced by Thomistic Aristotelianism were prime candidates for also being influenced by the Roman Church in the West. However, this argument can also be used with respect to the Platonists, and examples of these influences can be found in those who were pro-Aristotelianism, for example Kydonis, but also in those who had come under the influence of the theology of Thomas Aquinas. Plethon, an ardent Platonist who propagated neo-paganism and secularization, also imparted these influences to his pupil Bessarion and to the West.³⁶³ These two are examples of the extremes that seemed to permeate those who followed philosophical trends and gave rise to a new trend that exemplified secularization or profane science and the resulting morality.

In the example of Bessarion, Isidore of Kiev and Plethon, all contemporaries of George Scholarios, we find examples of those in the pursuit of philosophy who became indifferent to the doctrinal matters of the church. Their interests were mainly centred on the pursuit of philosophy, especially Platonism, rather than on the integral subject of doctrine.³⁶⁴ A recapitulation of this example is given by Bertrand Russell in a summary description of Italian civilization in the latter part of fifteenth century: “they (the Italians) were in earnest about culture, but not about morals and religion”.³⁶⁵ Do these

³⁶³ Runciman, *Mistra*, 116; Woodhouse, 187.

³⁶⁴ Tsirpanlis, 58-61. This point of view is expressed by Tsirpanlis in relation to Eugenikos and in general that Byzantine society was rooted in the Palamite ecclesiastical-political “credo” as reinforced by the ecclesiastical policy of John Kantakouzinus and the Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos, and that the philosophical speculations were rooted in the growing influence of anti-clericalism to be found in the West (which is my point of view).

³⁶⁵ Bertrand Russell, *A History of Western Philosophy, and Its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945), 498.

circumstances also characterize the period prior to the Hesychastic controversy and the contemporaries of that period?

The need for spiritual revitalization, as mentioned above, was to counterattack the steady growth of philosophical innovations or the phenomena conventionally designated as the 'Renaissance', which was experiencing the subsequent secularization that followed in its footsteps. The theological convictions, particularly in the case of Barlaam, were a loose adaptation of various philosophical speculations that did not provide sound theological formulas when confronting a person who was very well versed in the theological traditions of the Fathers in the East. It is for this reason that Akindynos advises Barlaam to be cautious of Palamas.³⁶⁶

The quest of investigation caused cross-cultural influences, especially in the field of philosophy, that subsequently motivated further theological speculations. At times these forces coincided and also collided in their endeavour to articulate their positions. Their sole aim was to provide the kinds of logical and explanatory answers that the West was encouraging, through philosophical reasoning based on Aristotelianism and Platonism.

These methods of reasoning were utilized in the processes of deduction and argumentation that were prominent in the theological, scholastic tradition of the West. This system of scholasticism directly and indirectly became a major influence on individuals who had inherited these traditions from the Latin West and infused this method of deduction into the thinking of many in the East.

³⁶⁶ Akindynos, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*. See second and third letters to Barlaam: forthright direct advice concerning Hesychasts and Palamas, 28-33.

In the summation of this statement above, a few in the East saw the West as no longer a nation of barbarians, but as a receptacle of Hellenistic learning that the East seemed to have forgotten. This element of conviction that the East perceived in the West was an acknowledgment by a variety of Byzantine humanists that the East was not a purveyor of the ancient Hellenistic tradition that now resided in the West, a viewpoint that was upheld by Scholarios and previously by Kydonis. In fact the implication when Kantakouzinus triumphed in the civil war and subsequently apprehended imperial power; this was seen as a disaster by the humanists from whom the anti-Palamists recruited most of their members.

In the midst of the religious zealotry that permeated Byzantium during this period, there were certain individuals who, due to their pursuit of secular studies, exerted much influence on others.³⁶⁷ These two forces seemed to be ever increasing and undermining the existence of the Eastern Roman Empire. This must be seen in the light of the consequence of the anti-Palamite stance by the opposition to the Palamists and also by the re-emerging secularists or humanists.

What has been emphasised constantly is that the growing threat to the Empire initiated the question of ecclesiastical union. A problem that became paramount, especially in the face of political urgency, was that the Empire was not only dealing with the Turks, but in its deliberations had created tension with the Latins. It is apparent that soon after the draconian method inherent in the policies of union of the Emperor Michael Palaiologos; future emperors persisted in pursuing a dialogue with Rome to facilitate union. It is

³⁶⁷ Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, 422-434; Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 517. In the fourteenth century Emperor John VI Kantakouzinus became the co-emperor with his legitimate and future son-in-law, John V Palaiologos, exerted influence in the field of philosophical speculations. He was motivated by the growing threat of Mohammedanism and fostered this general interest in the field of higher learning. This became the basis for counterattacking the growing influences generated by the Turks, but also the growing influences of the West.

ironic that emperors who are credited with religious zealotry were also in pursuit of negotiations to affect the union between the churches. Kantakouzinus is credited with exercising a decisive influence in assuring the triumph of Hesychasm,³⁶⁸ and is also one of the emperors who pursued the question of union with Rome. Apparently, the quest for union cut across all party lines. If this was the case, then why did certain individuals pursue the quest for union? It was to pursue a political response within the Empire.³⁶⁹ It was the prime reason that motivated Kantakouzinus to direct Kydonis to the study of Latin literature and indirectly also in this system of policy, under Emperor John VIII Palaiologos to motivate Scholarios towards this same endeavour. Where delineation does reside between of various philosophical or theological groups, it depends upon the relevance of their policies towards the political issues.

These policies dictated by Rome to Emperors Michael, John V and John VIII are most poignantly audacious in their demands of Constantinople and the Eastern Church. The policies dictated to Michael VIII by Rome are repeated towards future emperors without taking into consideration the advice given to the Pope at Avignon by Barlaam. The quest for union was not solely the result of Roman/Papal ideology, but was an endeavour to secure aid in the face of impending danger for the Empire.

In fact the pursuit of unionist policies was not limited to pro-unionist emperors but was also engaged in by those who were staunch advocates of the Eastern Church. Since emperors followed this line of policy, union with Rome, it is only to be expected that certain individuals, guided by the examples of their superiors, instructed others to acquiesce to these policies and subsequently became even more diligent in pursuing

³⁶⁸ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 103.

³⁶⁹ Joseph Gill, 'Eleven Emperors of Byzantium Seek Union with the Church of Rome', *Eastern Churches Review*, (1977): 76-83.

them. The pursuit of philosophical studies were not always for the academic circle of intellects but also at the behest of policies demanded by the imperial state for her own political agenda. Those who followed these policies were individuals such as Kydonis, Bessarion and Scholarios.

Barlaam, who defended the Orthodox point of view concerning the Filioque in confrontation with the Dominican Fathers, willingly returned to Italy and to the bosom of the Roman Church when the Orthodox Church condemned him for heresy in the Hesychastic movement.

Kantakouzinios, a theologian who authored the Palamite apologies³⁷⁰ as a defender and propagator of Palamism or Hesychasm, was not opposed to theological dialogue with the West. However, he was apprehensive of the difficult problems that could arise from this dialogue. Political necessity dictated circumstances that ultimately were negative towards the interests of Constantinople. The one aspect that governed why the emperors of the East sought union was the overriding presence and dominance of the Latins. This same situation and reasoning can be applied to the interests of John VIII in 1438 when the Council of Ferrara-Florence was convened and ultimately revealed the position of Scholarios as one positive towards Unionism.

³⁷⁰ Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 103.

4.4 Misuse of Words: Summarizing, Correcting or Re-Translating?

An initial interest in philosophy was the stimulus for Scholarios' introduction to Thomistic speculations on theology, which in turn, as Livanos states, provided the impetus to further a better understanding of Aristotle. Moreover, as it has been emphasized, the ultimate goal in this course of study was the dissemination of imperial propaganda.

Aristotle's philosophical account of logic was deployed as a means to define man's reasoning. The aim of Aquinas' theological speculation, however, was to further define the Christian interpretation of the concept of man and his relationship with God, and also to clarify theological Christian dogma, particularly the Dogmas of the Roman Church.

Aquinas use of philosophy to define theology motivated Scholarios to study Thomistic theological speculations, with the expectation that Aquinas' clarifications in cognitive language would allow a full understanding of reality to be achieved.

Arguments about logic, which Aristotle put forward to formalize the "rules for correct reasoning of the basic principles of categorical logic" were strictly adhered to by Thomas Aquinas, and subsequently also by Scholarios.³⁷¹ Initially, philosophy was Scholarios' main concern, or more specifically, the applications of Aristotle's philosophical studies, which were motivated by his interest in theological exegesis. Subsequently this would form part of the project to disseminate imperial propaganda.³⁷² The corrections and summaries that form the large part of Scholarios' later works were

³⁷¹ Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer, *History of Theology* vol 1, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 182-184; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 15.

³⁷² Ibid. 29.

initially undertaken due to this interest in Aquinas' theological works and its uses for the purposes of imperial propaganda, but were eventually adapted to Christian apologia.

However, Barbour argues that "Scholarios never translated a single one of Aquinas' strictly theological works and all of Gennadios' (Scholarios') Thomistic translations are philosophical".³⁷³ Barbour further argues that '*De ente et essentia*' was not Scholarios' work but, for the most part, a translation of a fourteenth century Latin commentary by a Dominican, Armandus de Bellovisu.³⁷⁴

There are, however, discrepancies in this argument. Livanos does not concur with Barbour on the question of whether Scholarios translated any of Aquinas' work, as he points out, this argument cannot be applied to the later part of Scholarios' life. In examining Scholarios' output, it is evident that even though he might not have re-translated '*De ente et essentia*', a theological work, or perhaps not in its entirety, the mere fact that he produced over one thousand pages of translation of Aquinas' other theological works, indicates his competence in this regard. For if Scholarios was correcting and summarizing, as he emphasized in the opening lines of '*De ente*', then the implications are, firstly, that he was a reliable theologian entrusted to articulate and examine such works, and secondly that the work was to correct and not to translate the already existing translated work. Hence the phrase 're-translation and commentary' would a more accurate account of his work in this context.³⁷⁵

³⁷³ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 56.

³⁷⁴ Ibid. 57.

³⁷⁵ The two major works of Aquinas, the '*Summa contra gentiles*' or in French '*Somme contre les Gentils*' and '*Summa theologiae*' or '*Somme Theologique*', were translated by Kydonis in 1354. Presumably '*De ente et essentia*' had already been translated as stated above, primarily by the Dominican Armandus de Bellovisu and maybe it was translated again by Kydonis, and the work that Scholarios was doing was to summarize and correct the already translated work. See Kianka on her dissertation about Demetrius Cydonis 118. All the titles have been translated by the author of this thesis, to which '*Summa contra gentiles*' will be as 'Resume of the Summary against the Gentiles', '*Summa theologiae*'

After serving his first period as Patriarch in 1464, Scholarios “continued his apologetical writings, composing two dialogues between a Christian and Jew and in the same year began his re-translations of the two *Summae*, ‘*Summa contra gentiles*’/ and ‘*Summa theologiae*’. When, however, he does provide a Greek resume of the two *Summae*, he is careful to say that it is for his own private study”.³⁷⁶ The use of the word ‘Greek’ clearly suggests an existing translation from Latin into Greek of the *Summae*. In fact the *Summae* had already both been translated by Dimitrios Kydonis, ‘*Summa contra gentiles*’ in 1354,³⁷⁷ and Kianka states that Kydonis’ work on the ‘*Summa theologiae*’, began in this period as well.³⁷⁸

If the two *Summae* were already translated, then the word ‘translation’ has been misapplied to Scholarios’ contribution which, in fact, consists of comment, summarizing and, re-translating of the already translated works.³⁷⁹ We may question how precise Bellovisu’s work relating to ‘*De ente et essentia*’ might have been especially in terms of the accuracy of the Greek language. Scholarios’ contribution may have been a process of correcting the Greek anomalies, contrary to Barbour’s implications. Thus we can conclude that the translations done by Kydonis were in circulation and were in use by those interested in this particular study in Byzantine society. Another relevant factor to note is that Scholarios continued his apologetical or polemical writings, composing two dialogues between Christian and Jew, the third Trait on the Procession of the Holy Spirit an exposé de of the Orthodox Faith and numerous

will be translated as ‘Summary of Theology’, ‘*De ente et essentia*’ will be translated as ‘On Being and Essence’ and ‘*De anima*’ as ‘The Soul’.

³⁷⁶ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influences*, 22–23; Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 56.

³⁷⁷ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 91. In fact, Kianka stipulates the exact time and date 3:00pm 24 December 1354.

³⁷⁸ Ibid. 92.

³⁷⁹ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 91–92; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 426.

Jugie states that the translation and commentary of the booklet on Thomas Aquinas of *De ente et essentia*, are summaries; Turner emphasizes this fact.

prior works that were his own work. In a letter written to John, a student, in 1450, Scholarios emphasises there were misinterpretations of Aristotle's works and that he was engaged in translating Aquinas' commentary on '*De anima*'.³⁸⁰ The translation of '*De anima*' would have been under way in the years 1449–51. From information already given and the previous work on Aquinas' '*De ente et essentia*', we can deduce that Scholarios was re-translating well before 1454 and summarizing too. The process of summarizing and re-translating would then inform Scholarios' later work on the *Summae*.

The failure to recognise Scholarios' later translations after 1446, (completed by Scholarios when he was well into his fifties or sixties,³⁸¹) is a failure to create a full historical record of his work. This omission runs the risk of undermining Scholarios' reputation as an accredited theologian. Turner confirms that Scholarios' summarizing *bears a considerable linguistic resemblance to that of Kydonis*.³⁸² To study, summarize and re-translate would automatically imply possession of the original translated copies in the Greek language,³⁸³ strongly indicating that Scholarios was in possession of copies of Kydonis' Greek translations of Aquinas' works, which he then re-translated and summarized for easy mobility. He produced summaries in order to avoid carrying Aquinas' voluminous works that had been totally written in his own hand. The fact that 1447 was the year that the '*De ente et essentia*' was corrected and commented on

³⁸⁰ Scholarios, 'Translation of the Commentaries of Thomas Aquinas on 'The Soul' by Aristotle', [Traduction du commentaire de Saint Thomas d'Aquin du De Anima d'Aristote], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VI. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), 327; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 426. See in ref. footnote 1. Brambillasca, Sulla traduzione greca di Glogio Scolario al Comm ento di S. Tommaso al De Anima, 40 (1966), 242-253.

³⁸¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios*, 24.

³⁸² Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 426, See ref. footnote of 3 on page 426; Scholarios, 'Summary against the gentiles' vol.V. 60.

³⁸³ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 56; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 23.

indicates that the reading and study of Aquinas' works was prevalent in the Byzantine court. It would rule out another supposition that has also been asserted; that the translated works of Aquinas into Greek were not destined for the already converted—the Latins—but instead, as Angelov points out, to re-convince those who had lapsed, and were in danger from profane and pagan influences or the unconverted.³⁸⁴

An additional point should be added here: in his reminiscing about the past and particularly in his remark about the pleasure he derived from his studies and from teaching, Scholarios regretted that so many of his books and papers were irretrievably lost in 1453. Thus, Scholarios affirms the existence of translated works of Aquinas and the need to re-translate them after his great loss.³⁸⁵ Scholarios' evident knowledge of Latin and the Italian language meant that he could read the works of Aquinas without recourse to translated works.³⁸⁶ The translated works that Scholarios had re-translated and summarized in 1464 were, as he asserted, for the edification of his readers and listeners.³⁸⁷

However, the suggestion that none of the theological works of Aquinas were translated by Scholarios prior to 1445 does seem correct. Up to this point, Scholarios did not translate, but certainly commented on, corrected, summarized and re-translated the lengthy translated work of Aquinas, as Turner confirms.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁴ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 180; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 117, 125-134; Herrin, *Byzantium: The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*, 315.

³⁸⁵ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To his Students', vol.IV.403, vol.I. 287–290; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 427.

³⁸⁶ Scholarios, 'The Cause of the Schism', vol. II, 18.

³⁸⁷ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 430; Julian Raby, 'Mehmed the Conqueror's Greek Scriptorium', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 37 (Washington DC: Harvard University, Dumbarton Research Library and Collection. 1984): 20. Raby's emphasis would apply to Scholarios, for without the inference it would be assumed that Scholarios was also writing these translated and summarized works for the edification of Sultan Mehmed II.

³⁸⁸ Ibid.

It would seem that Barbour emphasises the expectation of conformity to Orthodoxy in his definition of ‘Byzantine Thomism’, arguing that “a preference for Aquinas by the Byzantines was conditional; openness to the study was regulated always within the rigorous bounds of an ecclesial and social Orthodoxy”.³⁸⁹ However, the implication here is the exclusion of Scholarios as a legitimate theologian, as Barbour’s definition de-values Scholarios contribution to the search for common ground.

4.5 Cogency as a Theologian

Scholarios’ corrections and commentaries demonstrate his ability to comprehend the intricacies of the philosophical and theological debates. They indicate a continuing involvement in the theological speculations of Aquinas. Scholarios emphasized his correction of the other translated Western theological works was “in order to bring about the actual meaning of the work”³⁹⁰. This implies that Scholarios could comprehend not only Aquinas’ voluminous works, but also the works of Eastern and other Western theologians.³⁹¹

In the year 1445, Scholarios wrote on the causes of schisms, his premier tract on the ‘*Procession of the Holy Spirit*’ and his anti-Latin polemic work. He mentions Thomas Aquinas in reference to John of Damascus on the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and repeats these observations in 1446 in his ‘*Neofron*’, written in response to Patriarch Gregory Mammas. Scholarios’ work ‘*The Response to the Syllogisms of Mark of Ephesus*’ further clarifies the topic, but what is most evident is Scholarios’ thorough

³⁸⁹ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 26, 29, 42.

³⁹⁰ Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence- To Matthew Kamariotis’, vol. VI. 180, v20–21.

³⁹¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 20.

knowledge of Aquinas' theological writings.³⁹² According to Turner, '*The Response to the Syllogisms*' was written in the year 1442, preceding by about three or four years the aforementioned '*Procession of the Holy Spirit*'. This would indicate that Scholarios was well versed in the theological writings not only of Aquinas but also other Western and Eastern theologians by this period,³⁹³ and from the date appearing on his poetry, as early as 1431.³⁹⁴

The issue of the revival of imperial rhetoric, as previously stated, was not limited solely to the theological writings of Aquinas, but also had an impact on other fields such as panegyrics, homilies and sermons. We see, as Jugie points out, that Scholarios was following the norm, adhering to the methodology of the panegyric tradition.³⁹⁵ The dogmatic content of '*The Sermon for Holy Friday*', written during his Patriarchate, is repetitive of former sermons or works, including '*The Sermon for the Feast of the Annunciation*' given prior to the suspension of his duties and title by Gregory Mammas in 1447. The topic of this sermon was the Primitive state of Man, Original Sin and the Divine Plan of the Incarnation and followed the traditional requirements for rhetorical treatises as laid out in '*The Rhetoric of Aristotle*'. This tradition is evident in the example that Petit cites in his introduction to Scholarios' works.³⁹⁶ But, most

³⁹² Scholarios, 'Response to the Syllogisms of Mark of Ephesus on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Réponse aux syllogismes de Marc d'Ephèse sur la procession du Saint Esprit], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 476.

³⁹³ Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence', 93.

³⁹⁴ Scholarios, 'Epitaph of Dimitrios Laskaris Leontaris become Monk under the name Daniel', [Építaphe de Démétrius Lascaris Léontaris devenu moine sous le nom de Daniel (1431)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 377.

³⁹⁵ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. v. See the introduction verse and comment made by Petit; Scholarios, 'Agreement of the Eastern and Western fathers ', vol.II. 398. See the section which designates the theological teaching of Western and Eastern Tradition; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 64; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 426.

³⁹⁶ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI. vi.

importantly, Scholarios' presentation of his work draws visibly and directly from Thomas Aquinas and the Western Church Fathers.³⁹⁷

As stated, as early as 1431 the predominant theme in Scholarios' poetry is theology and this preoccupation extends to the larger part of Scholarios' works. The question we must ask is why would the majority of Scholarios' works be on the subject of theology, when his initial interest was in philosophy, echoed in Scholarios' poems, panegyrics, sermons and philosophical works: were they really all orchestrated towards the theme of theology? As has been noted previously, if they were, it was for the dissemination of ecclesiastical and imperial ideology.³⁹⁸

When we examine them closely, Scholarios' early translations of Aristotle's works are not entirely philosophical, but do have something of a theological tone, even if this is quite limited.³⁹⁹ According to Bradshaw, the theological theme found in Book One of Aquinas is repeated in Scholarios' work. An example of the repetition of the theological theme found in Scholarios' translation is in Aquinas' work on Aristotle's philosophy, in which Aquinas' reflections, though rooted in Aristotle's description of divine thought, go beyond Aristotle's concepts by enhancing the Christian argument.⁴⁰⁰

To question Scholarios' theological aptitude would be to question of all his theological works. However, an examination of the theological works of Scholarios indicates that

³⁹⁷ Scholarios, 'Introduction-The Sermon for Holy Friday', in *Œuvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. I. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), xlvii, 1, 137: 'The Sermon for Holy or (Good) Friday' is also of dogmatic content. He repeats much of what had been said in 'The Sermon for the feast of the Annunciation' on the primitive State of man, sin and the divine plan of the Incarnation. In this speech, as in most of the other reported so far, the speaker draws visibly on saint Thomas of Aquino'; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 426.

³⁹⁸ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 47.

³⁹⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 24.

⁴⁰⁰ Scholarios, 'Philosophical Works' vol. VIII. 211; Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 247; Aidan Nichols, *The Shape of Catholic Theology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 301.

not only did he correct theological works, often reflecting the linguistic choices of Kydonis, but also reveals the political tenor of these works. For instance, prior to the taking of Constantinople, Scholarios dedicated a '*Christian Apologetics*' address to the Mohammedans in a text barely eighteen pages long. In 1461, however, after the taking of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks and, while Scholarios was still Patriarch, Scholarios dedicated fifty-three pages to the errors of the Jews ('*Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew*'), following a brief exposition on the faith of the Christians, which helps to support the case for Scholarios theological capabilities.

The word 'error' is used in the address to the Jews, while to the Ottoman Turks there is a apologia of the validity of the Christian faith which, Scholarios stipulates, is the only way to achieve salvation.⁴⁰¹ The '*Christian Apologetics*' addressed to the Ottoman Turks was written while Scholarios was still at the Monastery of Pantocrator before his transfer to the monastery of Harsianitis. This places the work in the year 1450, the year of Scholarios tonsuring as monk. This year is significant as it was the that year Emperor Constantine XI re-advocates the Union of the churches, officially declared in 1439, and in which Scholarios sends letters in his opposition to this re-declared Union, first to the Emperor's brother, Dimitrios Palaiologos in 1450, and to the Emperor Constantine in 1452. This implies recognition of the pending political dominance of the Ottoman Turks and a necessity for deploying politically correct language.⁴⁰²

The work that was addressed to the Jews and subsequently to the Ottoman Turks in the later part of Scholarios' life reflects Scholarios' opposition to the Union. The contrast is

⁴⁰¹ Scholarios, 'Apologetic Writings addressed to the Mohammedans', vol.III. 434.

⁴⁰² Scholarios, 'Letter to Demetrius Paleologue against the Union of Florence', [Lettre à Démétrius Paléologue contre l'union de Florence], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 117 ; Scholarios 'At Emperor Constantine Contre the Union of Florence', [A l'empereur Constantin Contre l'union de Florence (12 mars 1452)], vol.III.152.

tremendous for it indicates a political language of instruction rather than a theologically explicit exposé. It seems that the work concerning the Jews written in 1461 is not in fact about the errors of the Jews, but indirectly addressed to the Mohammedan Ottoman Turks. Considering that the Jews were a very small minority compared to the Ottoman Turks, the words must be a work of subterfuge to address Mohammedans indirectly without being too obvious. Prior to the year 1445, Scholarios' theological work was mostly directed towards the Latins. This is in marked contrast to earlier work, such as *'The Procession of the Holy Spirit'*, which refers to a major doctrinal difference with the Latin West, whereas later work emphasized theological discrepancies with the Jews and the Mohammedans.⁴⁰³ What is significant is the direct political/theological response by Scholarios to the Mohammedans through an address to the Jews.

The projection of the political into the theological sphere is never more obvious than when Scholarios debates scriptural and theological subjects. The emphasis is seen in *'The debasement of Our Lord on the Cross'*, *'Peter's denial'*, *'The Incarnation of the Son of God'*, *'On the tree of Life'*, *'Second coming of Christ'*, *'Miracles'*, *'On the title of servant given to Our Lord'*, but especially upon theological aspects of *'The Principal Messianic Prophecies'*. These works were all written in this same year, 1464, around the time when Scholarios abdicated his position for the second time as Patriarch and when he was still debating and expounding *'The distinction of the Divine Persons'*. Moreover the focus of the argument is on Thomas Aquinas' exposition of this topic.⁴⁰⁴ It is impossible to overlook the extent to which Scholarios' theological treatises are polemical, inasmuch as he endeavours to expound the Orthodox Christian point of view

⁴⁰³ Scholarios, 'Third Treaty on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Troisième Traité sur la procession du Saint Esprit (après 1446)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. II, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), 458. The section is dedicated to the third Trait on the Procession of Holy Spirit (after 1446) which denotes the main theological emphasizes prior to this date was towards the Latins.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid. 251–433.

to the Latins and also to the Mohammedans. For the topics mentioned above are not solely for the benefit of those who are converted to the Christian faith, either East or West, but also for those who are not.

4.5 Theology as Apologia

Thus, we can suggest there is an alternative motive at work here; most of Scholarios' translations were philosophical, since this was the method of approach that was utilized, following the rhetorical tradition. If so, then when Scholarios translated, commented on and summarized theological works, not only by Aquinas but also by other Western Church Fathers, notably Augustine, he was motivated solely to clarify and instruct in the course of dialectical reasoning.

The theological factor then is to be understood only as political necessity motivated by the need to argue theologically with the Latins on crucial topics that were deemed of prime importance for both Byzantines and Latins, in the period when the Latins were the dominant force. The ability to resolve theological disparities in order to obtain aid was crucial, but this was difficult to prioritise in a period when the Ottoman Turks had taken Constantinople, and the need to obtain military aid and pecuniary assistance from the Latins had lost its political impetus.

We can suggest here that the use of Greek texts of the two *Summae* by Scholarios had a political motivation, for Aquinas had originally employed dialectical reasoning to analytically define theology and confront heretical influences, namely by the Albigensians and primarily the Mohammedans in the thirteenth century. In re-

translating and correcting or summarizing these specific works of Aquinas, Scholarios seems to be very attentive to the political dimension of the work.

Scholarios' commenting and correcting cannot be perceived solely as an exercise to further the study of Aquinas' works or those of Augustine. His amendments must be examined in the light of his having to translate and comment on these works in order to enhance the political agenda of the day: in this case to reason with the 'unconverted'. Scholarios is effectively declaring this in the statement "in order to bring out the actual meaning of the work".⁴⁰⁵ The political camouflage is evident, when "he is careful to say that it is for his own private study".⁴⁰⁶ The two dialogues between Christian and Jew, the expose of the Orthodox Faith, and subsequently the work on *'De ente et essentia'* and *'De anima'*, likewise the work on the *Summae*, are chosen to direct the field of study towards a specific group, and to incorporate them within a political schema. The implication is evident in the priorities and scope of Scholarios' theological writings and compositions.⁴⁰⁷

Scholarios was not governed by rigorous ecclesial bonds or by philosophy but, by the rigorous bonds of imperial edicts that governed the imperial state and directed its influence in political and ecclesiastical affairs, since the imperial system was propaganda.⁴⁰⁸ Barbour has insisted that the emphasis was on Christian Orthodoxy, on

⁴⁰⁵ Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence-to Matthew Kamariotis', vol.VI. 180, v20–21.

⁴⁰⁶ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 22–23; Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 56.

⁴⁰⁷ Scholarios, 'Commentaries of the Works of Aristotle' vol. VII., 2v29–34; Scholarios, 'Poetic Works', vol.IV, 369; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 24; Turner, 'The Career of George Scholarios', 426; Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*, 320–321.

⁴⁰⁸ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 29. The evidence presented by Angelov is relatively recent, published in 2006, whereas Barbour's work dates from 1993. Barbour's use of the term social/political Orthodoxy might otherwise have benefited from Angelov's explanation. As has been suggested, philosophy used dialectical reasoning to analytically define theological knowledge, primarily Thomist theology. These analyses caused great consternation among the Byzantines, for the theological theme was part of the political manoeuvring, since the two were intrinsically interwoven in the political demands of the Latins and the Byzantines.

ecclesiastical rather than political dominance.⁴⁰⁹ But as Sylvester Syropoulos' summary of the proceedings of the Council of Florence indicates, the Emperor's dictates as to what was desired and what was to be discussed were paramount. The implication is that there was a distinctive political motive on the part of all the participants at the Council.⁴¹⁰

The tradition of philosophical thought was immersed in the system of theological poetries, panegyrics and homilies, and this is reflected in Scholarios theological works. His theological aptitude is not only confirmed by these works, but is reflected in the position he held in the imperial bureaucracy, for, "he had already become a public figure with the titles of πρωτασηκριτής, καθολικός κριτής τῶν Ρωμαίων", (loosely translated as Official Prime and Universal Examiner of the Romans) and master in theology at the Imperial Palace.⁴¹¹ His aptitude in delivering homilies and sermons confirms not only the tradition of imperial theological ideology at court,⁴¹² which suggests competence as a theologian, but also as an observant imperial official.⁴¹³

Theology, rather than philosophy, was of prime importance for political concerns, even though Livanos does state that Scholarios used Aquinas exclusively as an aid to understanding Aristotle.⁴¹⁴ Scholarios continues to apply the guidelines of the Aristotelian rhetorical canon used by Aquinas in order to articulate his thoughts and illustrate theological correctness. Hence, I claim, Scholarios' theological works were purposely coordinated to that endeavour, which is apparent in the major theological

⁴⁰⁹ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 18.

⁴¹⁰ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 480–482.

⁴¹¹ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI.vi; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 47.

⁴¹² Scholarios, 'Antilatin polemic-Lamentation on the Proclamation of the Union at Constantinople', vol.III.180 v22-25.

⁴¹³ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 19-21.

⁴¹⁴ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 24.

translations, summarizations and commentaries undertaken in 1444, and this continues until the end of Scholarios' life.

4.6 Περὶ Ψυχῆς -De anima

The importance of the translation of '*De anima*' '*Περὶ Ψυχῆς*' and '*De ente et essentia*' '*Τοῦ Θωμᾶ, Περὶ Διαφορᾶς Οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ Εἶναι*' for Scholarios cannot be overestimated nor minimized. The method of presentation emphasizes the need for the laws of rhetoric, and the use of metaphysics, as they are defined by Aristotle. This method is explicitly deployed by Aquinas, and is followed unequivocally by Scholarios in his correcting and summarizing of '*De anima*' and '*De ente et essentia*'.⁴¹⁵ This system of thought is further deployed in all of Scholarios' 'translations', as well as than those mentioned above. For instance, in the *Summae*, Scholarios continues to confirm his adherence to Aquinas and his theological speculations. In volume VI of Scholarios' works, a third of the text is dedicated to '*De ente et essentia*' and a further third to '*De anima*'.⁴¹⁶

Aquinas' work '*Summa contra gentiles*' (1259–64) was commissioned by Pope Urban IV as political/theological intervention '*Against the Errors of the Greeks*', which was written in 1263.⁴¹⁷ The fact that '*Summa contra gentiles*' is emphatically directed towards the conversion of Mohammedans, Jews and Greeks, explains Scholarios' interest in the annotation of these works. An examination of the major theological

⁴¹⁵ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 242.

⁴¹⁶ Scholarios, 'The Soul', [*Περὶ Ψυχῆς*] [*De anima*], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VI, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1933), vol. VI.327–581 ; Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence', vol. VI. 154–326.

⁴¹⁷ Tract of the Catholic Faith against Gentiles [Tractatus de fide catholica, contra Gentiles [contra errores infidelium] 1263 'Against the Greek errors', [Contra errores Graecorum, ad Urbanum IV Pontificem Maximum)

works of Scholarios, particularly after 1444, reveals the criterion which governed his choices; acknowledgement of the influence of the political directives of the imperial ideology.

'De anima' is considered to be the best of Aquinas' commentaries on Aristotle's work and, according to Petit, Scholarios' commentaries on Aristotle and Aquinas' works are regarded as "superior to the original". Petit states: 'These references are an improvement so they can be followed almost line by line in the Greek text of Aristotle, accompanied by the Thomist comment'.⁴¹⁸ This supports the claim for Scholarios' quality of work and his ability to be simultaneously conversant with philosophy and theology.

When Scholarios commented on this work he held the title of καθολικὸς κριτὴς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ([universal official] General Examiner of the Romans), confirming he had imperial approval.⁴¹⁹ Petit confirms that the title Scholarios is using as he writes this commentary can only be from the period before his loss of favour with imperial authorities. *'The Soul'* [*De anima*] must have been written in 1445–6 and *'On Being and Essence'* [*De ente et essentia*] in 1447.⁴²⁰

Scholarios' abridged and translated voluminous manuscripts, copied in his own hand, of the Thomistic masterpieces of the two 'Summaries' [*Summae*], twenty years later, together with the translated works of *'De ente et essentia'* and *'De anima'*, specifically emphasize his philosophical and theological adroitness and his political command of the issues in question.

⁴¹⁸ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI. ix.

⁴¹⁹ Καθολικὸς κριτὴς τῶν Ῥωμαίων ([universal official] General Examiner of the Romans) - the examiner of all theological and political themes pertaining to Orthodoxy and to the security of the Imperial Authority.

⁴²⁰ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI. ix.

Scholarios' translation of Aquinas' commentaries on Aristotle's *'De anima'* is particularly interesting. Rendering the Latin text in Greek and following a precise commentary of Aristotle's Greek text, Scholarios demonstrates a more than adequate academic knowledge of the sciences.⁴²¹ The fact that Scholarios translated this work of Aquinas referring directly to Aristotle's works indicates his desire for clarification, particularly on theological topics.

In Scholarios' translation of Aquinas' commentaries on Aristotle, he consistently observes Aquinas' texts precisely and with very little deviation from the original. Normally the commentaries and the translations are an analysis of an individual text. However, this approach limits the work to the confines of that specific text, generally examining and presenting it within the formal discipline of the text alone.

The work explores the analytical explanation of Aristotle on the soul, and the way in which Aquinas follows this in his commentaries, explaining the Christian consciousness of the immortality of the individual soul.⁴²² He explains the importance and difficulties of the study of the soul, question of method, previous theories of Plato and other Greek philosophers such as Democritos, Pythagoreans, Anaxagoras and Empedocles on the soul as self-moving essences in Book I, chapter III. The elements that do not have souls, the definition of the soul and body, and the different elements pertaining to this observation, are all reviewed by Scholarios and annotated, including the question of

⁴²¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 78.

⁴²² Scholarios, 'Annotations on the Three Books *'de anima'*', [Annotations sur les trois livres du *'de anima'*], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. VII.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 429-454; Kenneth M. Setton, *Europe and the Levant in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. 'Byzantium and the Italian Renaissance' (London: Variorum Reprints, 1974), 74.

how the soul causes body, and the errors concerning the vegetative principle. Aquinas' works in Book II chapter IV are also reviewed by Scholarios.⁴²³

The senses and their function in correlation to the function of the soul, and the function of Intellect in its various degrees in Book III, chapter VIII, are noted by Scholarios on page 534. '*Principle of Movement in the Living Being*', Book III, chapter IX is again noted in Scholarios' work.⁴²⁴ The whole of Aquinas' work is reviewed with personal annotations, as Scholarios endeavours to clarify and expand upon the key points.⁴²⁵

However, Aquinas diverges from Aristotle; he is projecting his interest in the Christian concept of the soul, onto the Aristotelian (pagan) text.⁴²⁶ Scholarios emphasizes the Christian concept. When he comments on Aristotle's work, as Petit confirms, he follows Aquinas devotedly.⁴²⁷

It has been observed that in his translation of '*De anima*' Scholarios makes Aristotle more consonant with the Christian faith.⁴²⁸ At the point of his divergence from the Imperial Authority and their pro-Union policies, Scholarios transferred the system of philosophical and theological approach nurtured in the imperial bureaucracy to what he saw as the inevitable political reality of the time. '*De anima*' is directly related to the work of '*De ente et essentia*', where there is not only an implied reference to Avicenna but also to dissenting teachings. It suggests Scholarios had Gemistos Plethon in mind, for this work is a direct rebuttal of Plethon's concept of the soul. Plethon upholds the Platonic view that man is composed of two different essences – he (man) is consistently

⁴²³ Scholarios, 'Commentaries on The Soul', vol.VI. 410.

⁴²⁴ Ibid. 540.

⁴²⁵ Ibid. 410 v15

⁴²⁶ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 69; Siniosoglou, *Plato and Theodoret*, 234-244.

⁴²⁷ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI. ix; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 23-31.

⁴²⁸ Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence', vol.VI.179–180. The topic of the soul is mainly evident in the Eastern Orthodox community since Michael Psellos and Plethon have also written on this subject: See footnote 70 in the above of this thesis.

divine and also animal – the immortal essence that is immortality of the soul, and the mortal essence that is the body.⁴²⁹ The difference between with the Christian concept of the soul and that of Plato’s emerges when the soul is part of the divinity, which is mirrored in the Plethonean doctrine of inner kinship with the gods.⁴³⁰ The notion that the text is a rebuttal of Plethon does not undermine the idea that the main address of the text was to the Latins and the Mohammedan Ottoman Turks, however.⁴³¹ For example, in criticising the use of the word ‘babble’, Scholarios draws attention to what he sees as theological errors, for he points to the blasphemy that is committed by the teachings of Mohammed against the True God.⁴³²

‘*De anima*’ was translated in the years 1445–6, when Scholarios held his title καθολικός κριτής τῶν Ρωμαίων ([universal official] General Examiner of the Romans)⁴³³. The work was written while he was still in good standing and not in his nadir years with the imperial authority when the title was taken from him when, after 1445, he asserted his anti-Union stance. His title and his work therefore would have had imperial endorsement and a political agenda. The work was to aid in the clarification of Christian doctrine in opposition to the erroneous teachings that were being propagated, a problem which had become more acute. Thus the importance of the position and title that Scholarios held was the official assessor of all doctrinal problems, which impinged upon the theological norms of the imperial state, hence the ‘General Examiner of the Romans’ (καθολικός κριτής τῶν Ρωμαίων).

⁴²⁹ Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 25; J.A. Demetrakopoulos, *Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios Florilegium Thomisticum. His early abridgment of various chapters and quastiones of Thomas Aquinas’ Summae and his anti-Plethonism*. (Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales 69, 2002), 117-172.

⁴³⁰ Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 22; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 189-190.

⁴³¹ Scholarios, ‘On the Need to Rescue Constantinople’, vol. I., 296; Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 72-73.

⁴³² Ibid. 302.v20–30.

⁴³³ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.VI.ix; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius’, 429.

'*De anima*' could not be seen as a typical translation of Aristotle's work nor of Aquinas', for the the translation promotes the Christian apologia in the context of the ever-growing presence of the Ottoman Turks. All works after this point were directed towards this undertaking. Even though he occasionally digressed to his earlier primary topic, the Filioque, which was a focus of debate between Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Church, Scholarios' major topic was his apologia of the Christian faith after this period.

4.7 Τοῦ Θωμᾶ, Περί Διαφορᾶς Οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι -*De ente et essentia*

As I have previously suggested, Scholarios' philosophical treatises on his translation and commentary on the topic of *the speculation of being* should be viewed in the following light: Aristotle's metaphysics were discussed and subsequently Aquinas was re-utilized, as part of the explanation of man's reflection of the image of God. Rather than going into too much philosophical detail about the clarification of the word Being (existence) and Essence (*how essence is found in substances and in accidents*), a succinct elucidation is offered in the following extract: "The invisible things of [God] are clearly seen, being understood through the things that have been made was cited to show that the existence of [God] could be known and proved from those of his effects that are known to us. Then the word spoken in the person of God to Moses became the ground for the five ways by which Thomas, with aid of Aristotle, proved the existence of God".⁴³⁴ The culmination of the natural law is synthetized into the Christian conception by Thomas Aquinas.⁴³⁵

⁴³⁴ Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol.3. 289.

⁴³⁵ Giovanni Ambrosetti, *Right Natural Christian*, [*Diritto Naturale Cristiano*]. (Rome Italy: Editrice Studium, 1970), 119. "We have said repeatedly that the natural right, is an ontological principle, but has always given rise, in doctrinal process, to a connection with the social environment, and woven this into

The crucial element in this particular work, is man and his relationship with God, for Aquinas, explaining the metaphysics of Aristotle in the light of the questions that are asked about God, truth, existence, people and their destiny towards God,⁴³⁶ on the nature of the word ‘man’ and the word ‘humanity’, which signifies the essence of man. Aquinas’ explanation of the act and potency of being is repeated in Scholarios’ commentary.⁴³⁷ Scholarios provides a commentary on the topic of plurality but with a more limited explanation than that of Aquinas.⁴³⁸

Scholarios’ examination of Aquinas’ *De ente et essentia*’ and his commentaries on Aristotle in the subject matter of transcendentals, causality, the ontological foundations of logic; substance, properties and accidents, led him to extend the explanation of the metaphysical understanding of the human person as to the nature of angels in a personal form, to infer the existence of God.⁴³⁹ It is not, as Jugie points out, solely an exercise in Aristotelian philosophy, but governed by the need to present a Christian apologia.⁴⁴⁰ Scholarios repeats the work of ‘*De ente et essentia*’, but in a condensed and personal explanation and, noting the obvious difference in the explanation, indicates the impact of the errors of the Latins to whom this observation is directed, with respect to their theological conclusions in the study of the nature of God.⁴⁴¹

However, it is noteworthy that at the beginning of his commentaries, Scholarios presents the errors that are perceived by Ibn-Sînâ or, as the West commonly knows him,

the social and cultural sense. This is the reason why natural law manifests itself as an element rather than in the abstract, as present and responsive in the field of culture”.

⁴³⁶ Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 20.

⁴³⁷ Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence’, vol.VI. 189–191.

⁴³⁸ Ibid. 193 v.17–20.

⁴³⁹ Ibid. 200–272.

⁴⁴⁰ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, vol.III. See page xxix—the explanatory section as to the reason for this particular work, which is an apologia towards Mohammedans.

⁴⁴¹ Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence’, vol.VI.198.

Avicenna (however, Scholarios employs the spelling Avinsénas).⁴⁴² Scholarios had a particular motive in presenting this work in the year 1447. For, in examining the nature of man in confrontation with the nature of angels and God, Scholarios attempts to inform those who are willing to hear, and to clarify the Orthodox teachings on man's relationship with God. There is a two-pronged endeavour, one that addresses the Latins and secondly one that speaks to the Ottoman Turks. The main thrust of the work of '*De ente et essentia*' is to confront the errors committed by the Latins in theological doctrine but also in a subtle manner to address and explain the Orthodox Christian doctrine in confronting the ever-present Mohammedan Ottoman Turks.⁴⁴³

In a footnote, Jugie reminds us that Scholarios was a public figure holding the position of theological examiner.⁴⁴⁴ But he had also become the Chief of the Assembly of the Orthodox, who were a group of anti-Unionists. If we assume that this anti-Union group was not in good standing with the imperial and ecclesiastical authorities, it follows that the result would be Scholarios' 'loss of favour' at court. As Jugie writes: "He had already become a public figure with the titles of Examiner, General examiner of the Romans (πρωτασηκρητης, καθολικος κριτης των Ρωμαιων), and master of theology at the imperial palace. In this last role he imposed from time to time the homilies and sermons in the Court." We can note the use of the word 'imposed', for the word would

⁴⁴² Ibid. 154. Scholarios writes Ibn-Sînâ name in Greek as Αβινσένας (Avinsénas).

⁴⁴³ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. vi. The timing of the approximate date when *De ente* was written has been discussed above and is indicated by Jugie. Scholarios was summarizing and translating *De ente et essentia* during the time before he became a monk, since he does not address himself as Gennadios, as he did in his works after 1450.

⁴⁴⁴ Scholarios, 'Summary against the Gentiles', vol. V. 178–180; Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. vi; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 426. Moreover, in the period 1445–7, Scholarios states he was more than satisfied as a professor of philosophy and in the company of his students, stating this in a personal letter addressed to Matthew Kamariotis, as noted by both Jugie and Turner.

denote an administrative authority enforcing its agenda and thus regulating the components of what was to be presented.⁴⁴⁵

The different perspectives on Scholarios' position at court may suggest he was trying to present a favourable image, but one that was more favourable than true. It has been suggested that in terms of his theology, Scholarios was governed first by the political factors and motivations of the imperial Authority.⁴⁴⁶ However, when the Latin issue had lost its impetus in military importance, and political dominance was transferred to the Ottoman Turks, Scholarios transferred his focus of interest to theological matters that were more advantageously important in relation to the Ottoman Turks. It is evident in the scope of his theological work that, prior to 1445; he emphasized mostly those theological subjects that were the major divisions between the Eastern and Roman churches.⁴⁴⁷ The period from 1444 onwards is dedicated to explaining the Christian apologia to Mohammedans and chastising Jews for their errors.⁴⁴⁸ An added factor that should be stated is the conversion of Orthodox Christians to the conquering Turks that was taking place at the same time that Scholarios' translations and comments were

⁴⁴⁵ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.VI. ix.

⁴⁴⁶ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic', vol.III.21. The dialogues of 'Neofron' emphasize he lost all credibility at court, and that he did not have the title that Scholarios refers to above, since this was taken from him by the pro-unionist Patriarch Gregory Mammas in the year 1446. This would indicate that the year 1447 was not just his 'nadir' year as Turner suggests, but rather the year of his demise, as he was experiencing a loss of favour at court in this period.

⁴⁴⁷ Scholarios, 'Summary against the Gentiles-Providence', [De la providence], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. V. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1931), 165.v.29. To summarise; Scholarios made specific choices that are reflected in his correspondence and the content of the topics he translated and summarized. In this period Scholarios was not writing about the theological differences with the Latins, since he was at his lowest ebb in his anti-union stance, he was specifically translating and summarizing theological topics that were strategically aimed towards a specific group. At this point, the Latins had lost all hope that they would be able to aid the Byzantines and Constantinople in military assistance; and plus the pro-unionist Byzantines were gradually leaving for Western shores for their own security, so the dogmatic issue with the Latins had lost its impact; Herrin, *Byzantium*, 315. The forceful conversion of Christians to the Mohammadan faith is a major problem in the period for Kydonis and also Scholarios, which gives additional reasons for the studies undertaken by both these individuals.

⁴⁴⁸ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.III. xx. Editors commentaries on 'Polemic against the Jews', [Polémique contre les Juifs], 'Apologetic Writings addressed to the Muslims', [Écrits apologetiques à l'adresse des Musulmans], xxix, 251, 434.

being written,⁴⁴⁹ as well as Plethon's apparent support for paganism, in his enthusiasm for Platonic epistemology and ontology, thus the stated aim of these works was 'to address various political and theological entities'.⁴⁵⁰

In referring to Avicenna (Ibn-Sînâ) at the beginning of his work on '*De ente et essentia*', Scholarios outlines what he sees as the errors that are committed by Avicenna's metaphysics and philosophical theories, in his work '*On the Soul*'. Scholarios emphasizes he is addressing his remarks in two directions, to Plethon; and to the Mohammedan Turks.⁴⁵¹ The procedure he follows, in basic metaphysical terminology, is to advance a coherent Christian apologia in terms of the difference between essence and existence (*De ente et essentia*). We can see this as a response by Scholarios to the errors of Avicenna, in effect not only responding to Plethon but also to the Mohammedans, some of whom agreed with Plethon's theory.⁴⁵²

An example of the choice of topics with an obviously political agenda noted by Petit is the dialogue with Barthélemy Lapacci, Bishop of Cortona, in the autumn of 1444. When the first dialogue '*Neofron I Aeromuthia*' was written,⁴⁵³ and not more than two years after the prominent discussions which took place at the imperial palace after July 1444,

⁴⁴⁹ Scholarios' interest in the translation-summarizing of a particular topic was eventually redirected towards the inevitable conflict, in preparation for the dialogue for those who were to govern the City in the future or to those who were willing to change their faith, for political advantage. This is also apparent in the Christian apologia he addressed to the Mohammedans shortly before of the work on '*De ente*', where he specifies his reasons.

⁴⁵⁰ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 117; Scholarios, 'Scholarios Letters', vol.IV.471 v35–6; Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. III. xxix, 434.

⁴⁵¹ Copleston, *A History of Philosophy. Mediaeval Philosophy Part I*, vol.2. 'Augustine to Bonaventure', 211–213; The research by Scholarios in this topic '*On the Soul*' has an earlier implication as has been stated above See: Psellos, Holobolos.

⁴⁵² Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence', vol. VI.,154,178–180.Scholarios makes an unequivocal statement at the end of his letter to Matthew Kamariotis, advancing the account that has been presented; John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*. (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir Seminary Press, 1975), 131.

⁴⁵³ Scholarios, 'Introduction', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. II.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), xv–xvi. See Intro: The first two treatises were composed within one year and only a few weeks or months apart. The first did not begin until the autumn of 1444, and the second was completed prior to August 1445.

between Scholarios and Barthélemy Lapacci’, Scholarios’ stance on Orthodox perspective of the Procession of the Holy Spirit is robustly defended.⁴⁵⁴ This illustrates that in the short period between the death of Mark Eugenikos on 23 June 1444 and the autumn of the same year, he launches, as Petit states, an ‘impetuous fight’, “and argues with Lapacci, in long discussions on the Filioque and without delay in writing, giving them the shape of a long polemic treaty on the ‘*Procession of the Holy Spirit*’. Within a short period, ‘*The Apologia*’ addressed to the Mohammedans (1445–6) is written, subsequently also ‘*Neofron*’ (1446) and the translation and summary of ‘*De ente et essentia*’ (1446–7).⁴⁵⁵ If we examine the content of these works, other than the obvious theological polemics solely against the Latins on the Filioque Clause, the issues appear directed not towards the Latins, but towards other major players in the political and domestic arena.

4.8 The Two Summae: ‘*Summa contra gentiles*’ and ‘*Summa theologiae*’

In their translation and explanation of Scholarios’ works in volume V, Petit, Siderides and Jugie illuminate the difference between the two *Summae*. Scholarios has 336 pages on the first part of ‘*Summa theologiae*’, which alone exceeds in scope the ‘*Summa contra gentiles*’. By dedicating a larger number of pages to the ‘*Summa theologiae*’ Scholarios indicates he had explicit reasons to research more deeply into the works of Aquinas, especially during the period between resigning his office as Patriarch, which ended in 1456, and his second tenure as Patriarch, which ended in 1464.

⁴⁵⁴ Scholarios, ‘Antilatin Polemic’, vol.III. 1, 21; Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), .xi; Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 432.

⁴⁵⁵ Scholarios, ‘Introduction’, in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. V. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1931), viii, 1-21.

The decisive reason that led Scholarios to undertake this work is given in the preface, where he states the motivation is the political agenda. This stated reason does not seem to be the entire circumstance; however, as it is clear it was also for reasons of personal utility.⁴⁵⁶ After the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks and his first resignation from the Patriarchate in 1456, barely two years after taking office at the end of September 1453, Scholarios was experiencing a rather turbulent life. He returned to Constantinople more than once, probably from April 1463 to June 1463, and also experienced a forced return to the capital from August 1464 to autumn 1465.⁴⁵⁷ In view of the uncertain future he faced, he decided to summarize the two *Summae* by Aquinas for his personal use, as he himself explains.⁴⁵⁸

The actual reason for Scholarios' summaries of the two *Summae* of Aquinas' works—even though re-translating and summarizing as Scholarios claims for his own personal use—was to emphasize the need to articulate Christian theology. Summarizing the works of Aquinas, prominently the '*Summa theologiae*' regarded as a synthesis of Aquinas thinking, and largely philosophical in nature, was imperative because it pertained to the salvation of man perceived in the definition of the Christian concept of God—since Aquinas' intention was to set forth *Sacra doctrina*, Scholarios was engaged likewise in his exposé of the Orthodox Faith.⁴⁵⁹

Scholarios' commitment to the apologia as an exposé of the Orthodox Faith had its origins in an earlier period. It goes back to the main reason Dimitrios Kydonis undertook his study of Latin theology and made translations of the *Summae* from Latin

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid. vi-vii.

⁴⁵⁷ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 67–84; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 439.

⁴⁵⁸ Scholarios, 'Summary against Gentiles', vol.V. 1.

⁴⁵⁹ Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, See Preface, ix.

to Greek a hundred years earlier.⁴⁶⁰ Kydonis begins his assignment with the reading of Aquinas' *'Summa contra gentiles'* in which he found clear language, strict method and mastery of Aristotelian philosophy, used primarily to contest the Mohammedans. Kydonis shared Aquinas' views about this undertaking.⁴⁶¹

In the period of Scholarios' difficulties with the imperial bureaucracy, as a result of his advocating a stance of anti-Unionism, he was recommending Aquinas and advancing further study of his works. Scholarios found the scholastic, rational method of Aquinas' theology enlightening, as did Kydonis before him.⁴⁶² For Aquinas works 'made readily comprehensible those parts that create a synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and used them to articulate Christian dogma, which confirms Aquinas as the most excellent interpreter of Christian theology'.⁴⁶³

Livanos, who shares this view, states that, when Scholarios was in the process of resigning the seat of the Patriarchate, he continued his apologetical writings stipulating the divinity of Our Lord, and also composed two dialogues between a Christian and a Jew in 1464, and that his work on *'De ente et essentia'* and *'De anima'* was specifically for instruction.⁴⁶⁴ Turner disagrees, and suggests that, though he is not directly

⁴⁶⁰ George Dennis, 'Reality in the Letters of Demetrius Cydones'. In *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides*. Edited by Charalambos Dendrinos et al., 401-10. (Aldershot: Ashgate 2003), xxvii.

⁴⁶¹ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 81; Mercati, 'Information of Procoros and Dimitrios Kydonis', 124-125; Horst Rudolf Abe, *The social structure of the Erfurt student body in the middle ages 1392-1521* [Die Soziale Gliederung der Erfurter Studentenschaft im Mittelalter 1392-1521], ed. Horst Rudolph the Rector of the Faculty of Academy of Medicine, Egbert Schwarz, Abe, contributions to the history of the University of Erfurt, (1392-1816) (2nd ed.). (Erfurt, Germany: Rector of the Medical Academy Erfurt, 1962), 11-13.

⁴⁶² Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 21; Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 45; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 426.

⁴⁶³ Scholarios, 'On Being and Essence-To Matthew Kamariotis', vol. VI. 178; Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 243.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid. 445.

confronting Mohammedan doctrine, Scholarios is nevertheless using dialectical reasoning to impart the Christian faith to the non-believer.⁴⁶⁵

Scholarios' theological writings commentating on and summarizing Aquinas' works do seem to have an instructive purpose. Even in earlier writings it appears that he had in mind the works of Aquinas, which bore fruit in the commentary on '*Summa contra gentiles*', and in several tracts entitled '*Procession of the Holy Spirit*', and also in his literary works on the Trinity and his attacks against the Filioque Clause. As early as 1446 there was a politically instructive dimension to this work.⁴⁶⁶

One further aspect of this work which is pivotal, other than the Christian apologia to instruct the Mohammedans, is the conversion of Orthodox Christians to the faith of the newly dominant Ottoman Turks. This is reflected in the writings of Scholarios reprimanding his fellow Byzantines for the loss of faith, and in his letters putting forth his anti-Union polemic with respect to the proclaimed Union of the churches that occurred a few years before the taking of the city by the Ottoman Turks.⁴⁶⁷ In the eleven years that had elapsed since that decisive year of 1453, Scholarios was focusing on his fellow Byzantines who had either converted to the Roman Church or to the Mohammedan faith.⁴⁶⁸ Certainly these apostasies would have been uppermost in Scholarios' mind, even in the later part of his life, and they were to become a

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid. 447.

⁴⁶⁶ It is apparent that Scholarios is correcting and summarizing '*Summa contra gentiles*' in 1464 after the various periods of his office as patriarch and more intensively after 1453, when Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks, suggesting a politically instructive agenda, rather than a solely theological exercise directed by philosophical interests.

⁴⁶⁷ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Letter to the Grand Duke against the Union of Florence', and 'Lamentation on the Proclamation of the Union at Constantinople', vol.III.136, 180.

⁴⁶⁸ Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State.*, 506; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 145-147; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 223; Deno John Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization seen through Contemporary Eyes*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 383.

predominant subject of interest in his translations, corrections and summaries.⁴⁶⁹ The dialogues, apologetic scriptural theological works and subsequently the translation and summarizing of the two *Summae* were not arbitrarily produced, as the opening passage in the work on '*Summa contra gentiles*' clearly indicates.

It can be deduced that the correcting and summarizing commentaries of the two *Summae* began in 1464, motivated by the need to argue convincingly in favour of the Christian dogma against the ever-growing and forceful conversion of Christians to the dominant religion currently governing Constantinople.⁴⁷⁰

4.9 Latin Theological Influences

In Book 1 of the '*Summa contra gentiles*', Bradshaw detects some aspects of Dionysian influence; however, he affirms that the development of the implications of divine simplicity is drawn from Aristotle's and Augustine's theological speculations.⁴⁷¹

Scholarios refers to this in volume V of his collected works, demonstrating that he was as knowledgeable about Augustine's works as he was about Aquinas' theological speculations. The ability to argue using Western sources, particularly on the topic of the simplicity of God, was a strong asset when responding to Mohammedan theology.

⁴⁶⁹ A prime example of conversion is reflected in the case of George Amiroutzis, who had attended the Council of Florence with Scholarios as advisor, but ultimately found service with the Ottomans after Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks; his son, too, converted to their religion. See Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 228–229; Raby, 'Mehmed the Conqueror's Greek Scriptorium', 24; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 404–408; Donald M. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, Last Emperor of the Romans*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 95–128.

⁴⁷⁰ Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios*, 45; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 426.

⁴⁷¹ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 222. God is His own act of understanding and His own will. It follows that God is His understanding and will. Each of these conclusions is simply a different way of describing the single self-contained activity that is God; George Florovsky, *Bible, Church, and Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View* (Belmont MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1972), 110; Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 31.

In Book II, Aquinas begins by distinguishing two kinds of operation and their relationship to Him.⁴⁷² His understanding, will and love belong to the first, whereas His creating, preserving, and governing of creatures belong to the second type. The work is intricate. As Bradshaw states, despite the fact that Aquinas oscillates between the two conceptions of God, Scholarios nevertheless endeavours to address all the discrepancies⁴⁷³ and in the process exposes inconsistencies in the '*Summa theologiae*'.⁴⁷⁴ However, it remains unmistakable even with the perceptible oscillation in this work that, in his re-translating of Aquinas' work, Scholarios was advocating the Christian doctrine without the obvious proselytization. However since Aquinas utilized Augustine's theology to advance his own theological speculations it is more than likely that Scholarios would follow him and do likewise.⁴⁷⁵

Scholarios' second tract on '*The Procession of the Holy Spirit*', section on the positive arguments of Greek opinion' explains previous doctrinal errors that afflicted the Church, which he presents by noting Nestorian, and Monophysite heresies.⁴⁷⁶ The noting of these heresies was not solely for the admonition of the Latins, as even though ostensibly the tract is justifying the Orthodox position on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, it includes discussion of other doctrinal diversities. The period of this tract is dated 1445, which would suggest that Scholarios' other works on *De Anima and De ente et essentia* were to be translated for political incentives. The date of 1445 would indicate the general direction of of Scholarios' writings at this time, since the political

⁴⁷² Scholarios would refer to this speculation of Aquinas in reference to Gregory Palamas expound on the doctrine of essences and energies.

⁴⁷³ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 247.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid. 249,256. A pointed note by Bradshaw states: "*the entire discussion of the beatific vision in the 'Summa contra gentiles' makes no reference to the body, save in the observation that human felicity does not consist in bodily goods or pleasure*"; Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.V. 3-4.

⁴⁷⁵ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', .447.

⁴⁷⁶ Scholarios, 'The Positive arguments of Greek Opinion', [Les arguments positifs de l'opinion grecque], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.II. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), 408-422.

necessity acquiring military aid from the Latins had lost all its impetus, and the proposed idea of the Union of the churches was becoming obsolete.⁴⁷⁷

Both Aquinas and Scholarios (who was following Aquinas in his theological attempts to define doctrinal conceptions), were motivated in their theological speculations by Augustine. The example given in the '*Summa theologiae*' of Divine Simplicity clearly draws upon Augustinian sources for the key principles of its theological conclusions.⁴⁷⁸

Aquinas, followed by Scholarios, draws from the two sources, both Aristotle and Augustine, in their observations on the *Simplicity of God*.⁴⁷⁹ This heritage of theological concepts from Augustine is also to be found in Aquinas and Scholarios' speculations about Original Sin and Divine Predestination.

The West was wholly indebted to Augustine for analytically defining doctrinal dogma, which the Roman Church would endorse accordingly. When Aquinas employed the theological speculations established by Augustine there could be no other recourse but to follow Aquinas' use of the original sources, and Scholarios, as an ardent follower of Aquinas, would in turn reproduce Aquinas' theological direction. Scholarios comments extensively on the subject of Divine Predestination; in Volume I of Scholarios' collected works, seventy pages are dedicated to the topic.⁴⁸⁰

Livanos elaborates on this by stating that Martin Luther and Scholarios were alike in accepting Augustine's teachings on Original Sin, and that they go beyond the doctrine of the Catholic Church in their Augustinianism, to embrace the doctrine of

⁴⁷⁷ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 392.

⁴⁷⁸ Scholarios, 'The Cause of the Schism', vol.II. 9; Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 253.

⁴⁷⁹ Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 246; Paul Evdokimov, *Ages of the Spiritual Life* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998), 155.

⁴⁸⁰ Scholarios, 'Divine Predestination', vol.I.390–460; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of Development of Doctrine*, vol. 4. 'Reformation of Church and Dogma' (1300-1700) (Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1989), 278–280, 1–42.

Predestination.⁴⁸¹ This claim hints at the ambiguous theological complexities that are found in Augustine but it also acknowledges Scholarios' zealous observance of Aquinas in theological matters and would make Augustine second only to Aquinas among Western theologians who exercised greatest influence upon Scholarios.

Scholarios' examination of the section on the Latin Church Fathers on the subject of the Procession of the Holy Spirit indicates a very comprehensive knowledge of the subject, where he outlines a comprehensive patristic historical account of the development of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁸² But in Volume I of Scholarios' works, comprehensive study is also apparent in his analysis of the subject of Predestination, the question of the Soul (anima) and Purgatory. Dedicating a large section to these particular subjects suggests Scholarios feels it is essential to undertake this analytical explanation. The topic of predestination is a key subject in Plato's discussion of the pre-existence of the soul and a key issue in the developing arguments of Augustinian speculative theology.⁴⁸³ The interest in these subjects emanates from the domestic political and philosophical debate; Aristotle versus Plato in the confrontation between Scholarios and Plethon, on the extent to which Aristotle's philosophy is compatible with Christianity⁴⁸⁴

The work directly addresses the philosophical and theological debate and disagreement Scholarios has with Plethon, particularly on areas of philosophical ambiguity between Plato and Aristotle. As a strong supporter of Plato's philosophical speculations, Plethon expresses his aggressive opinion towards Scholarios by describing him as being in

⁴⁸¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 64; Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 168; Scholarios, 'Divine predestination', vol.I.390–412.

⁴⁸² Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic- First Dialogue on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', vol.III. 1, 49.

⁴⁸³ Scholarios, 'Divine Predestination', vol.I. 391–539.

⁴⁸⁴ Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 240; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism of Byzantium*, 125.

*ignorant and intellectual decrepitude.*⁴⁸⁵ The philosophical differences between Plato and Aristotle would have repercussions, which would be reflected in Augustine and Aquinas in the approach to their specific philosophical positions and theological speculations. As Jaroslav Pelikan writes, the speculative theology that is presented by Augustine is very ambiguous, and Aquinas endeavours “to re-establish the truth by rescuing Augustine from the compromising context of his Platonism”.⁴⁸⁶

Scholarios’ work *‘Of the Divine Predestination’* is in response to Aquinas’ work on *Summa Theologiae*, especially on the second part of his work referring to morals and grace, and subsequently also discusses the doctrine of predestination. Scholarios endeavours to clarify Aquinas’ theological writing about predestination. Scholarios astutely observes these theological speculations are not primarily extensions of Plato’s philosophical points, but also elucidate Stoicism.⁴⁸⁷

This observation made by Scholarios is insightful, since Augustinian theological speculations would have been determined by the principles of neo-Platonism rather than Platonism, as Neoplatonist principles are an extension of both Platonism and Stoicism. Scholarios appears to have a more than average insight on this topic. It is also evident that Scholarios is endeavouring to respond to the Augustinian treatises when he is composing his work *‘Of the Divine Predestination’* particularly in the section on *‘Predestination and Death after Saint Basil’*.⁴⁸⁸ Livanos also notes the Augustinian influence, and he finds added information on the doctrinal topic of Predestination in Scholarios’ lamentation letter written in 1460, which refers to Augustine’s concept of

⁴⁸⁵ Woodhouse, *Gemistos Plethon*, 283.

⁴⁸⁶ Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, vol.3. 270–271.

⁴⁸⁷ Scholarios, *‘Divine Predestination’*, vol.I. 390.

⁴⁸⁸ Ibid. 390, 412.

predestination.⁴⁸⁹ This brief account of the subject of predestination is not restricted to the confines of philosophy or theology, but refers to the political distinctiveness of the events the Byzantines are experiencing. For, considering the subject of predestination also involves addressing various theological differences, not solely with Plethon, but for the purposes of engaging in dialectic reasoning with the Mohammedan Ottoman Turks on the Mohammedan dogma of predestination. There could be only one reason for stating the heretical sources named in Scholarios' tract, which is emphasized in '*Summa contra gentiles*' and again found in the '*Summa theologiae*'—that these doctrinal errors refer to how Mohammedans perceive the Person of Christ.⁴⁹⁰

There is another feature of the Augustinian influence on Scholarios. Having stated specific theological speculations on Original Sin and Predestination there remains the subject of the Immaculate Conception, derived from Augustine's treatise.⁴⁹¹ Scholarios' works indicate that his conclusions were not based wholly on the theological speculations of Aquinas, 'whose influence he believed he could accept only with restraint', but for Scholarios, Augustine's status as father of the undivided Church was never questioned. To identify the Roman Church as in error about the concept of the Filioque Clause and to justify the Eastern Church view on this topic, Scholarios cites Augustine's general theory of the images of the Holy Trinity in his creatures.⁴⁹² Scholarios' Augustinian view of Original Sin then directs his views on the Immaculate Conception. Scholarios offers elucidation about the theological subject of the

⁴⁸⁹ Scholarios, 'Lamentation of Scholarios on Misfortunes of his Life', vol.I. 293; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 64; Ombres, *Latins and Greeks in Debate over Purgatory*, 2. See the Mendicant Orders, Franciscan and Dominicans emphasizing the doctrinal issues of the Roman Church.

⁴⁹⁰ Scholarios, 'Summary against the Gentiles', vol.V. 278, 368.

⁴⁹¹ Richard P. McBrien, ed., *Harper Collins Encyclopaedia of Catholicism* (New York: Harper Collins, 1995), 119.

⁴⁹² Scholarios, 'Doctrine of Saint Augustine', [Doctrine de Saint Augustin], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.II.eds.Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1929), 44; Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology*, vol.3:34.

Immaculate Conception. 'The dogma of the Immaculate Conception is as non-Eastern as it is non-Thomistic'.⁴⁹³

In the same volume, volume I, Scholarios' second tract, 'On the Origin of the Soul' specifically affirms the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, a doctrine that, as has been suggested, was not supported by either the Orthodox or the Roman Church.⁴⁹⁴ Scholarios wrote these works in 1444–5 and used his early works to guide his inclusion of the creed of the Immaculate Conception, repeated four to five years later, in the '*Sermon on the Feast of the Presentation*', written in 1449–50.⁴⁹⁵ The annotation of the creed, which was not confirmed as dogma by the Roman Church and would not be designated as such until 1850, confirms Scholarios' interest in Augustinian theological speculation. It also establishes a distinctively Franciscan influence on his work. The Franciscan influence can be discerned in the fact that Scholarios annotating the Order of the Franciscans in his work *De ente et essentia*.⁴⁹⁶ The correlation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception with the Franciscan Order is suggested by the acknowledgement of this creed by the Franciscan philosopher Duns Scotus, further reinforcing the implication about the Franciscan influence on Scholarios.⁴⁹⁷

As Petit states, Scholarios established his reliance on the various philosophical and theological sources, and he was also as well-informed about the theories of the Franciscan school as he was about the theories of the Dominican school to which

⁴⁹³ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 10.

⁴⁹⁴ Scholarios, 'Second Trait on the Origin of the Soul', [Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 501. v22.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid. 161.

⁴⁹⁶ Scholarios, 'Commentaries of On Being and Essence', vol. VI. 179.

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid. 178-180; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation', 96; Bradshaw, *Aristotle East and West*, 243.

Aquinas belonged.⁴⁹⁸ These observations suggest that, together with Aquinas who utilized Aristotle's philosophical and Augustinian theological concepts to formulate his own speculations, Augustine was a direct inspiration for Scholarios' own intellectual formation.⁴⁹⁹

Considering the amount of attention Scholarios devotes to the topics that have Augustinian influences, and that these topics were written about at various stages in Scholarios' life, including the period well after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, one can deduce that Augustine's influence on Scholarios, especially on his development as a theologian, was ongoing. In fact, Scholarios was well-versed in the theological theories or speculations of Eastern and Western Church Fathers and theologians, and was constantly reflecting in his commentaries and writings on the previous history of the theological debates that had plagued the Church. As we have seen, close examination of Scholarios' polemical anti-Union work, and the Christian apologia directed to the unconverted, as seen in the works on '*De ente et essentia*', '*De anima*' and the *Summae*, supports this claim.

Scholarios' admiration for Aquinas and for Augustine did not decrease, and Scholarios' continued commitment to the translation and summarizing of Aquinas' exegetical, theological and philosophical works supports the claim that this labour provided the

⁴⁹⁸ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol. VI. vii, and 'On Being and Essence-To Matthew Kamariotis', 178-180. This influence could be due to the religious Order of the Franciscans as it is notable stated by Petit. The Dominicans had also established religious houses in Constantinople, and this was part of a combined Western influence on the diminished Eastern Roman Empire. As Petit notes in his commentaries on Scholarios' works, "notwithstanding his sympathy for certain opinions professed by those of the habit of François he cannot stop to give praise to Thomas Aquinas, the best and the greatest of the Latin doctors. I do not know, he said, if Thomas has more fervent disciple than me, for to him any other Muse is unnecessary, and that would be the best understanding ..."

⁴⁹⁹ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vols. VI. vi-viii: The observation made by Petit regarding Scholarios supports the claim about his theological insights and his esteem towards Aquinas. "Thomas is the most praised, commended as an excellent interpreter of Christian theology who has picked up readily the various parts that make up Christian concepts, (ως αριστοτης χριστιανικης θεολογιας εξηγητης και συνοπητης), which redounds to Scholarios' ability as syncretic thinker and theologian".

framework of structured argument essential for anyone who wanted to study the sacred sciences more deeply.⁵⁰⁰

Jugie observes that the study of Aristotelian philosophy is the start of Scholarios' introduction to theological speculations of Aquinas, and the reason why Scholarios imitated Aquinas not only in the discipline of philosophy but also in theology, excelling as a theologian.⁵⁰¹ It also reinforces the argument that Scholarios was following the tradition that required a knowledge of rhetoric, as desired by the imperial bureaucracy. Having examined the theological implications of Scholarios' work in order to clarify his Christian apologia, we will now turn to the details of his relationship with Plethon, particularly considering their distinctive and very different views of the the future of the Byzantine state.

⁵⁰¹ McBrien, *Encyclopaedia of Catholicism*, 805.

CHAPTER FIVE – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PLETHON AND SCHOLARIOS

Chapter Five explores the relationship between Plethon and Scholarios. In this chapter, I examine the background of the relationship between Scholarios and Plethon, and the reasons behind the disagreements between the two figures. It is important to understand this disagreement because it represents a confrontation between two different approaches to fundamental philosophical systems, which will contribute separately to the political vision of each thinker.

Scholarios' defence of Aristotle and his reason for his defence were discussed in Chapter Three of this thesis, partly based on Plethon's defence in his '*De Differentiis*' of Plato's conception of God as superior to that of Aristotle's. Plethon asserted that the Platonic conception of God is more consistent with Orthodox Christian theology than the Aristotelian conception. Plethon advocates the re-establishment of the re-defined secular or Hellas state under the auspices of the guiding principle of Greek pagan ontology, as philosophical Hellenism, in lieu of the Christian God.⁵⁰²

I will argue that Plethon's strong support for this view, enhanced by his conceptions of redefined Hellenism, and the desire to re-establish a Hellas nation, is the reason for the acrimonious relationship between Plethon and Scholarios. Their disagreement is caused by their idiosyncratic views regarding the future of the Byzantine State.

⁵⁰² Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 14,223; Nikos K. Psemmenos, *Greek Philosophy from 1453 to 1821*. In Greek [Η Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία από το 1453 ως το 1821], 2 vols, *Philosophike Kai Politike Vivliotheke*. (Athena: Gnose, 1988),100.

A close examination of Scholarios' letters suggests we must look very carefully at his political deliberations on the Byzantine state to uncover what he is actually saying. The letters would initially convey the impression of supporting submissive retention of the imperial bureaucracy, regarding the issue of Union. But if we look more carefully, it can be seen that his formations were anything but what seems to be stated on the face of things. Scholarios has been described as a "syncretistic thinker, which has some merits on the basis that he sought to reconcile non-Christian and non-Orthodox thinkers with Orthodoxy, in his enthusiasm for Aristotle and Aquinas".⁵⁰³ Scholarios' attention to Aquinas' strictly religious works, coming as it does so late in his life, is an unusual feature of his thinking, and it draws us back to consider his acrimonious relationship with Plethon,⁵⁰⁴ especially when he (Scholarios) had become disillusioned with the Roman Church over the subject of Union, and the desired hope of aid has diminished in importance.

Initially, Scholarios' understanding of the imperial political propaganda system meant his political view of the future of the Byzantine state was entirely in keeping with imperial ideology.⁵⁰⁵ If Scholarios's motivation was to shine in the political arena, as reflected in his correspondence with the West and the Pope, then it suggests there are

⁵⁰³ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 74.

⁵⁰⁴ Scholarios' works in volumns.V and VI consist of the enormous amount of work by Scholarios on polemic against Plethon, which is conclusive, especially after the year 1444. It does imply the secular influence or the propagated Plethon philosophical ideology that is being asserted within the imperial state had to be addressed.

⁵⁰⁵ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 20. Scholarios' capability to undertake any deliberations with appropriate acuity has recently been questioned. This concerns his competency as theologian, since his capacity to adapt to a Western theological perspective could imply his inability to understand Orthodoxy properly and jeopardise the extent to which he can be regarded as an authoritative Orthodox theologian.

political reasons for his actions.⁵⁰⁶ Hence, the study of Aristotelian rhetoric and logic is of paramount importance for this aim, as noted in the third chapter of this thesis.

Both Plethon and Scholarios shared an interest in philosophy, but Plethon's reply to Scholarios on the question of whether Aristotle or Plato's philosophy was more amenable to Christianity suggests a political approach to this question that goes beyond the obvious philosophical and theological implications.⁵⁰⁷ Livanos argues that a political factor that dominates all the deliberations prior and post the Council. All movements by the imperial bureaucracy and Emperor during the preparation and aftermath of the Council are reflected in Scholarios' correspondence, which articulates the reason for the philosophical and theological preparations. As Livanos writes; "the task of defending Christianity against other religions became a priority for him shortly after the Ottoman conquest, and Thomas' systematic handbooks seemed to be the ideal guide in Scholarios' apologetic task".⁵⁰⁸ Defending Christianity in this context appears to be a political task over and above its philosophical and theological imperatives. The phrase "defending Christianity against other religions" obviously implies the Mohammedan Ottoman Turks, but could also apply to Plethon. These words could not apply directly to the Latins, since, being Christians; they are already of the same religion as the Byzantines, only with a different interpretation of key points of theological doctrine. This sentence must really apply to the Ottoman Turks and/or to Plethon's innovative idea of re-establishing a Platonic secular Hellas state.⁵⁰⁹ It cannot refer solely to the relationship between the Latins and the Byzantines.⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁶ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

⁵⁰⁷ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283.

⁵⁰⁸ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 22.

⁵⁰⁹ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 127. Siniosoglou explains that there was not exactly a pagan component to the philosophical debate, but a secular interest in political reform; Constantine G.

The motive for studying Latin and acquiring knowledge of Western theology was, I would suggest, always political, in that the unity of the churches could facilitate a joint expedition to thwart the advances of the Ottoman Turks. This was the main criterion of Dimitrios Kydonis' political policies in the middle of the fourteenth century and could also be seen as that of Emperor John VIII Palaiologos, as reflected in the proceedings of the Council of Florence.⁵¹¹

Scholarios' motive for his defence against Plethon's criticism of Aristotle has to be considered not merely in terms of philosophical interest, but in terms of the further implications of Plethon's position would entail. This might include an interest in the development of a Hellenistic state from a more secular political point of view.⁵¹²

In light of the politics that appears to underlie all negotiations with the Latins, and if we concur that Plethon's motive for criticising Aristotle was not primarily philosophical but anti-Christian and political, then Scholarios' opposition to him would be in turn motivated by an attempt to defend the future of the Byzantine Imperial state. This would include not only a defence of the Christian faith, but consideration of how Christianity would be aligned with a system of government in practical application.

5.1 Aspirations and Endeavours

Georgios Gemistos, better known as Plethon (Πλήθων) Gemistos—taking the name Plethon due to his great admiration for Plato—was born sometime after 1355, probably

Mamoni, *Mark Eugenikos, Life and Works* Grammatologiki Research. (Athens: University of Athens, 1954), 9-11.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid. 129. The example given by Siniosoglou in the establishment of a reformed state by Plethon was also pertinent to Sheikh Bedreddin in the Ottoman Empire.

⁵¹¹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 448–452.

⁵¹² Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 216.

in Constantinople, and died in Mistra in 1452/1454. He is considered the principal precursor of the revival of Greek learning in Western Europe.⁵¹³ During his sojourn attending the Council of Florence as an advisor, Plethon met Cosimo de Medici, who influenced him to found a new Platonic Academy,⁵¹⁴ and through this academy re-introduced Plato's thoughts to Western Europe during the period of 1438–1439.⁵¹⁵

Plethon rebukes Scholarios for not sending to him his work *A Defence of Aristotle*, a response to Plethon's work on *De Differentiis*. It highlights the difference between them⁵¹⁶; Scholarios' consistently emphasizes his priority concerns government, whereas Plethon's appears to rests on dialogue with "*reputable philosophers*". Dialogue with "*reputable philosophers*" implies discussion of philosophical concepts, but it certainly did not exclude Plethon's desire to bring about a political Hellas state.⁵¹⁷

The genesis of the disagreement between Scholarios and Plethon could be attributed to the proceedings of the Council, particularly concerning the preliminary version of the formula of the Filioque Clause written by Scholarios as an attempt to reconcile

⁵¹³ Ibid. 3.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid. 217.

⁵¹⁵ Ibid. 5, 7. The observation made by Woodhouse is incisive regarding Plethon's defence of his Hellas state. "It coincided with the last century of the Byzantine Empire and the first century of the Italian renaissance, in both of which Gemistos played a part. It also coincided with the Hundred Years' War between France and England. That war played a part in the emergence of nation-states in the West, notably Florence and Venice, which was a development that Gemistos hoped also to promote, particularly in its application in developing this system of political entity by entrenching the effort to promote it in the southern part of Greece."

⁵¹⁶ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV.3; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283. The statement then would suggest that Plethon sought to associate of men with philosophical interests, obviously as an alternative to his presence at the Council; Plethon was invited by some Florentine humanists to establish a temporary school to lecture on the difference between Plato and Aristotle. This would Plethon's continuous endeavour to propagate his theory of the Hellas State.

⁵¹⁷ Scholarios, 'On the Need to Rescue Constantinople', vol. I. 296; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 276; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 32–47; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424; Philip Sherrard, *The Greek East and the Latin West: a Study in the Christian Tradition*, (London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 120.

Byzantine and Latin positions on seemingly theological but also political differences.⁵¹⁸

The method and means that each side practices in attempting to work towards a politically acceptable agreement is a vital concern. A proposal to substitute “through the Son” for “from the Son” in the Filioque Clause by Scholarios was seen as a political manoeuvre, not only by the Latins but also by some in the contingent of Byzantines at the Council.⁵¹⁹

I would argue that the difference between Plethon and Scholarios is not so much a question of philosophical or theological differences⁵²⁰, but should be considered in terms of what each was trying to achieve in their political visions.⁵²¹ The implication is confirmed by the correspondence during the period of 1434–1437⁵²², which illustrates Scholarios’ perceptive political vision for the Byzantine Empire⁵²³ and is duly noted.⁵²⁴ His correspondence with the Pope, Eugene IV, expressing his hopes for the

⁵¹⁸ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 378-379; See Gill for a more in depth analysis of the minutes of the Council. *Council of Florence*, 180-303. Two individuals who played key roles in the proceedings of the Council and spread their influence in the acceptance of union were Bessarion of Trebizond, Archbishop of Nicaea, and Isidore, who was to become Metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia. Others attending included the formidable Mark Eugenikos, Metropolitan of Ephesus, and the laymen George Gemistos Plethon, George Amiroutzis and George (Gennadios) Scholarios—the only laymen in the contingent representing the East. They were all directly or indirectly former students of Plethon and served as advisers to the Council. (Both Bessarion and Isidore later became cardinals of the Roman Church.)

⁵¹⁹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 418–426. See page 414 on the speech by Patriarch Joseph on the needs of the economy to arrive at a mutual agreement on Union; Gill, *Council of Florence*, 244–245, 257.

Concerning the dialogue of Cesarini, Mark of Ephesus and Emperor John on the question of Union see; Geanakoplos Deno John, *Byzantine East & Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966), 84, 101; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 172. There are disparities between the views presented by Gill and Woodhouse of the proceedings of the Council, where the latter presents a more negative viewpoint.

⁵²⁰ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 414.

⁵²¹ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 347; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283.

⁵²² Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-The same to the Same (1435/1436)’, [Τὸ αὐτοῦ Τῷ αὐτῷ-Le même au même (1435/1436)], in *Euvrés complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 412-14. In affirmation that the letter emphasized the political vision then the work on *De Differentiis* must have been in formation during this period or immediately after the Council. There can be a confusion over the titles of these letters having the same titles, but are written at different point of time.

⁵²³ Ibid. 412–416. His letters four and five in 1435–1436 express Scholarios’ hope for Union and euphoria over the news of the forthcoming Council. The exhilaration expressed by Scholarios would definitely imply Scholarios’ participation in the preparations for the forthcoming Council.

⁵²⁴ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-to Pope Eugenius IV.’ vol.IV. 432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

achievement of the Union openly expresses his aspirations in political terms⁵²⁵ and also promotes Scholarios' own aptitude for the task.⁵²⁶

Further concerns about the much needed political assistance from the Latins are raised in Scholarios' correspondence on the subject of Union, and this was also a major concern in his letter in favour of Union and political stability; 'Necessary need for help for Constantinople' and another letter entitled 'Religious Peace'. Both letters were aimed at this specific political objective.⁵²⁷ The titles of these letters clearly capture the political urgency the Byzantines were expressing regarding acquiring assistance from the Latins.⁵²⁸

The participants were selected by the Emperor to attend the Council, and were especially chosen to enhance the probability of achieving this political aspiration; not only to acquire armaments but also economic aid. Obtaining economic assistance would also help to improve the state's assets and their future security. This emphasizes the manoeuvring needed to reinstitute and reconstruct the imperial state, as it was in great need of political and economic repair. Scholarios' aims in terms of this reconstruction would be seen as in complete contrast to Plethon' visionary account of what he wanted for the future of the Byzantine state. Plethon suggested reforms in the service of a regenerated Hellas at the time of the imperial state's greatest weakness in 1416 and

⁵²⁵ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-The same', vol.IV. 413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 292.

⁵²⁶ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Alex Lascaris (1438)', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds.Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), Letter xvii. 436; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 293. See chapters six and seven of this thesis for further discussion of the letters.

⁵²⁷ Scholarios, 'On the Need to Rescue Constantinople' and 'Formula of Reconciliation proposed by Scholarios', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds.Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 296, 375. Both these letters have some uncertainty as to their authenticity.

⁵²⁸ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 350. Scholarios' letters outline his hopes particularly in the policies of political manoeuvring, which reflected not just the aspirations the imperial power for political assistance for Constantinople, but also the feasibility of a stable and cohesive state, particularly after the loss of so much of her former territories.

again in 1418, indicate his own agenda but also suggest the the general need for the reconstruction of the imperial Byzantine state.⁵²⁹

Plethon wrote two '*Memoranda*', addressed respectively to Despot Theodore (Πρός τόν Δεσπότην Θεοδώρον-Consilium ad despotam Theodorum) in 1416, and Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos (Πρός τόν Βασιλέα Εμανουήλον-Oratio ad Manuelem Palaeologum) in 1418. In these, Plethon conveyed a radical socio-political reformist plan, one that was largely inspired by Plato.⁵³⁰ In the opening passage of his text Plethon emphatically states that Peloponnese is and always was the cradle of the genes of the Hellenes. "We, whose ruler you are, are Hellene by birth, as our language and national culture testify. Now no country can be found which is more intimately and closely connected with the Hellene than is the Peloponnese with the part of Europe near it and the adjacent islands. It is a country which the same Hellenes genos has always inhabited, as far back as human memory goes: no other people had settled there before them, nor have immigrants occupied it subsequently."⁵³¹ By this rationalization of the pre-existence of the presence of the genos of the Hellenes, Plethon attempts to empower the basis of his argument by appropriating the historical genealogy of the Peloponnese as the base for implanting and directing his ideology. He proceeds to elucidate various classifications which might strengthen and restructure the imperial forces. A majority of the population were in husbandry and pastoral activities, so he identifies three types of people; those that labour, those that provide for the labour and those who ensure security for the whole community. The system of taxation was to be imposed according

⁵²⁹ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol.II. 639.

⁵³⁰ Plethon, *To the Emperor Manuel: According to the Reality of Peloponnese* ed. J.P.Migne, *Patrologiae cusus Completus*, vol.160, 822-840; Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*, 197; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 4-5.

⁵³¹ Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*, 198. The translation is from this source with a few exceptions that I have clarified. See the Greek version on 823-824 in the above annotation of footnote 469; Barker, J, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, 312-313.

to the position the people held. Land nationalization and disciplinary laws are assigned by Plethon's conception and do not follow Plato's account of this subject. Currency, for example, in terms of the quality of monetary use and regulation of trade, are also coordinated according to Plethon's conception of these topics as he felt they were obligatory and required enforcement.⁵³²

Any emphasis on the Christian past was irrelevant and could not be entertained, so was expunged from the account, leaving only the classical period of Hellenic culture to accentuate "a political myth of different texture, with Lycurgus' Sparta rather than the metropolis of Rome at its centre".⁵³³ Plethon's interests are secular and they concern the political life, the structure of the state and how it should be developed. The main aim is to restructure the Byzantine state, its institutions, rendering to his perception, to allow for the renovation of imperial power.⁵³⁴ The two Memoranda emphatically underline the course of how the imperial state was to be governed and emphasise the constructive method that is to be implemented for its own security to eventually redeem its political dominance. Plethon observes that the course of history is affected by the quality of regimes and the moral and political values of their leaders, and this point is reiterated in his two Memoranda. Plethon endeavours to raise the Peloponnese into a "symbolic part of a proto-nationalistic ideal, enhancing a temporal, historical and man-made discourse intended to compete with Christian *economia*". This was the main catalyst of division between Plethon and Scholarios.⁵³⁵

⁵³² George Gemistos Plethon, *To Emperor Manuel: According to the Reality of Peloponnese*, P.G.160, 821A-840B; Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*, 198-206.

⁵³³ George Gemistos Plethon, *To the Despot Theodore: According to the Reality of Peloponnese*, P.G.160, 841A-866B; Yannis Smarnakis, 'A Contribution to the Archaeology of Modern Utopian Thought: History and Utopia in Plethon's Oeuvre'. *Historiein* 7. (2007): 104-105.

⁵³⁴ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 350-352. See Siniosoglou citing Baloglou, On Plethon's Lycurgus and Sparta (2005) 141-8.

⁵³⁵ Ibid.

In the second logos titled: To the Despot Theodore (Πρός τόν Δεσπότην Θεοδώρον)⁵³⁶ Plethon reiterates the same message as has been stated in epistle or memoranda to the father of despot Theodore, Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos. There is a similarity in the two logos of Plethon to Emperor Manuel and Despot Theodore, but one aspect that reverberates and will become more prominent later on in Plethon's 'On Laws', is the fiscal payments for clergy, but more specifically the projection of religious views and aversion to monastic life and their capacity for existence within the imperial state.⁵³⁷ Scholarios is well aware of this topic, well before his possession of Plethon's 'On Laws' text that was to solidify Scholarios' apprehensions about Plethon.

Scholarios was aware of the concept of a reformed secular Hellene nation, to be established in the southern part of Greece, that was being fostered by Plethon; however Scholarios' goal was to acquire political assistance in this period prior to and after the Council to aid Constantinople and the Empire. Any proposal, therefore, that promulgated what Scholarios considered to be a further deterioration of Constantinople's imperial system of organization, interest and identity, simply could not be entertained or be allowed to be proposed. Scholarios' correspondence emphatically demonstrates this desire for "the necessary help for Constantinople", and other letters also indicate the same sense of urgency.⁵³⁸ However we can see that what both Scholarios and Plethon were asserting, in their own particular and diverse ways, was a means "to preserve what they considered the most useful elements of Ancient Greek culture." Livanos argues this point "was often overlooked".⁵³⁹

⁵³⁶ Plethon, 'To the Despot Theodore: According to the Reality of Peloponnese', P.G.160, 841A-866B; Barker, *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium*, 210-211.

⁵³⁷ Plethon, 'To the Despot Theodore: According to the Reality of Peloponnese', P.G.160, 845A, 855A.

⁵³⁸ Scholarios, 'On the Need to Rescue Constantinople', vol.I. 296.

⁵³⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 72.

Quoting Markos Gkiolas, Livanos summarizes Scholarios' actions and their aftermath: "The Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios had burned the books of George Gemistos—that distant forerunner of Modern Greek nationalism and humanism—and waged war against the appearance of every liberal opinion. The church's enmity and laity throughout the entire long-lasting period of Turkish rule."⁵⁴⁰ Plethon's attempt to establish his Platonic view of a nation in the Peloponnese was certainly connected to his ardour for ancient Greek culture; subsequent many modern proponents of secularism could be seen as following in Plethon's footsteps. Siniossoglou writes: "the publication of the seminal book on Plethon, François Masai's *Pléthon et le Platonisme de Mistra*' emphasizes Plethon's magnum opus, 'The Nomoi', inspired by Plato's *Laws*, contained the constitution for a utopian pagan city-state".⁵⁴¹

Plethon's notion of a regenerated Hellene nation state would then be in direct opposition to the existence of the Byzantine imperial system, and would advocate the eradication of such a system, as well as the exclusion of the concept of Rhomaioisyné, which was defined over a thousand years ago.⁵⁴² Turner remarks that the "mutual suspicion and hostility, which was growing between Scholarios and Plethon, was perhaps partly because both of them held office as General Judge".⁵⁴³ We can see here why their relationship might encompass both mutual respect and animosity towards each other. Plethon's idiosyncratic viewpoints and political aspirations were generally known well

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid. 73.

⁵⁴¹ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 4–5; Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 269; Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 154.

⁵⁴² Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 142. "There is contempt for the faith; strong infidelity everywhere; for some it is called Hellenism; for others mere fatalism and atheism".

⁵⁴³ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 429. The point that is made here is that, since Plethon and Scholarios held the same title as general judge, a position that required the examination of political and theological problems of the Empire, they would both have to be engaged in analysis of political stability for the future of the Empire. This alone would be sufficient reason for the existence of animosity between the two individuals.

before the period of the Council of Florence in 1438 and probably fostered Scholarios' own growing political interests.

5.2 Sources of Political Vision

As a young man, Plethon went to study at Adrianopolis, by then the Ottoman capital, following its capture by the Ottoman Sultan Murad I in 1365. Adrianopolis was at that time a centre of learning, modelled by Murad on the caliphates of Cairo and Baghdad.⁵⁴⁴ In c1407, Plethon left Adrianopolis and travelled through Cyprus, Palestine and other places, finally settling, first in Constantinople then in Mistra, in the Despotate of Morea. This process of settling in Mistra was not by coincidence; his unusual views may have caused his forced eviction from Constantinople by the Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos.⁵⁴⁵ “He tried to conceal his true character, but was unable to do so when he sought to implant his ideals among his pupils and was dismissed from the City by the pious Emperor Manuel and the Church.”⁵⁴⁶

Plethon's forcible departure from Constantinople as required by the Emperor suggests his real views had been detected by this point, and were to become only more evident after his death in 1452. This implies the reason for Scholarios' reservations and apprehensions about Plethon's personal beliefs, even though they were not officially

⁵⁴⁴ Karamanolis, 'Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle', 253-258; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 26.

⁵⁴⁵ Scholarios, 'Letter to the Princesse of the Peloponnese 'on Treaty Law' of Gemistos Plethon', [Lettre à la princesse du Péloponèse sur le 'Traité des lois' de Gemistos Pléthon], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 152-3; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 24.

⁵⁴⁶ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 24.

condemned; there was general hesitancy about denouncing him publically because he was such a respectable figure.⁵⁴⁷

Allegedly it was Elissaeus who was the main influence on Plethon's scholarship, even though this is only inferred from a critical comment made by Scholarios. The reference to Elissaeus and other various philosophical influences implies a heretical element to Plethon's philosophical formation.⁵⁴⁸ Scholarios indicates that 'sinister influences' inspired Plethon's intellectual development, generated by Averroes, Proclus and Zoroaster⁵⁴⁹ (with the suggestion that Averroes, Proclus, Zoroaster and Mohammed also helped to motivate and formulate Plethon's conception of the nation-state.⁵⁵⁰

The concept of the Hellene state presented in the two '*Memoranda*' written by Plethon in 1416 and 1418, and addressed respectively to Despot Theodore and Emperor Manuel II, set out his proposals.⁵⁵¹ He also advised on the condition of the Peloponnese, compiled several volumes of excerpts from ancient authors, and wrote a number of

⁵⁴⁷ Scholarios, 'Letter to the Princess of the Peloponnese 'on Treaty Law' of Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV.152–4; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 24.

⁵⁴⁸ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-Letter to the Princess of the Peloponnese 'on Treaty Law' of Gemistos Plethon' vol.IV. 153; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 18, 24. Plethon's academic focus included particularly "history; such as classical (Thucydides, Polybios, Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Diodorus Siculus, Josephus, Appian Arrian) and Byzantine historians (Procopios, Cedrenus, Zonaras); biographers (Plutarch, Diogenes, Laertius); geography and astronomy (Strabo, Geminus, Ptolemy); music and prosody (Aristoxenos, Aristides Quintilianus); natural sciences (Aristotle, Theophrastos, Aelian, Galen); rhetoric (Hermogenis and others, on whom he wrote commentary); and moralistic writers (Prodicus the Sophist, Lucian and Plutarch), plus the concepts of Averroes, Proclus, Zoroaster and Mohammed"; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 406: Plethon was advocating to some degree the imperial tradition of formal rhetorical studies, but also recommending various studies that would suggest a broad consciousness of the sciences of philosophy and theology, not normally Christian, but from a variety of philosophical/theological perspectives.

⁵⁴⁹ Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 4; Kazhdan, 'George Gemistos Plethon', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 1685; Karamanolis, 'Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle', in *Byzantine Philosophy and its ancient Sources*, ed. K. Ierodiakonou, 254; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 25.

⁵⁵⁰ It must be noted that Plethon's interest in the Mohammedan legislation in administrative capabilities has to be associated with the growing influence of the Ottoman Turks, thus it will connotatively emphasize the political cognisance of Plethon and also indirectly as well as Scholarios in their political view of the future of the Byzantine State.

⁵⁵¹ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 4-5, 406.

works on geography that were relevant to the political concept he was to advance.⁵⁵²

The text describes how the Empire could be reorganized according to Plato's Republic, with political, legal and economic reforms. The mere fact that the recipients did not respond suggests that the imperial authorities were firmly against Plethon's concept and its political consequences, a resistance dating to back an earlier period.

It is very likely that Scholarios would have been advised of these circumstances when he commenced his service with the imperial bureaucracy in 1425, some nine to seven years after the '*Memoranda*' were sent. This would suggest Plethon's inclinations were well known before Scholarios' initial beginning in the service of the imperial bureaucracy.⁵⁵³

Plethon's exile by Emperor Manuel II to Mistra for "subversive behaviour by implanting his ideals among his pupils" suggests the potentially disruptive effects of Plethon's theories was very well understood, and this was be reaffirmed when Plethon advocated the re-establishment of a Platonic/Hellenistic state in his two '*Memoranda*'.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵² Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 74.

⁵⁵³ There seems to be a disparity in information regarding the relationship between Plethon and Emperor Manuel II as to the actual reason to the departure of Plethon from Constantinople to Mistra; for example John Barker states there were no recriminations on the part of Emperor Manuel towards Plethon when he accompanied the emperor in the dedication of Hexamilion Wall in the Peloponnese. See: Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus*, 420-421; See also regarding the Hexamilion Wall and the historical reason for its construction: Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos*, 23.

⁵⁵⁴ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 6. In Mistra, Plethon seemed to attract students from great distances, including Bessarion, later to convert to the Roman Church, and Mark Eugenikos who was to be recognized as a saint of the Orthodox Church. The paradox of having these individuals as his students only adds to the complexity of Plethon's own character, especially in regard to his aversion to the monastic life. Plethon's life in Mistra was eventful. In Mistra he taught and wrote philosophy, astronomy, history and geography, and compiled digests of many classical manuscripts and writers, as Woodhouse writes (*George Gemistos Plethon*, 38). One conclusive piece of evidence is that Scholarios was never a student of Plethon as certain earlier sources attest; Constantine N. Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-Evaluation of His Personality*, (New York: Centre of Byzantine Research), 1979, 38. The confusion caused by this information is due to the assumption of Scholarios' association with Mark Eugenikos, who was a student of Plethon at an early age, thus generating the general supposition that Scholarios was his student as well.

“The reputation of Plethon as a legal thinker, considering his research into Zoroastrian and Mohammedan legislation, is not only limited to this field. It also includes his exploratory research of excerpts from classical sources in his descriptive analysis of the history of the Peloponnese and the topography of Thessaly. Plethon’s research is obviously associated with his political agenda, as was noted by Scholarios.”⁵⁵⁵

‘*Summary of the Doctrines of Zoroaster and Plato*’, a summary version of the *Book of Laws*, which detailed Plethon’s own esoteric polytheistic beliefs, did not remain his sole interest in Zoroaster.⁵⁵⁶ He also researched excerpts from the twelfth century historian Cedrenus’ works on the topic of Mohammad as leader and legislator of the Arabs; this research can really only be linked to the growing dominance of the Ottoman Turks.⁵⁵⁷

The mutual perception of Scholarios and Plethon as visionaries for the reconstruction of the empire took an acrimonious turn. If we are to outline the various differences between Scholarios and Plethon that led to the antagonism between them, we have to look not only at their philosophical perspectives, but also at their political interests and allegiances.

I would argue Plethon’s assertion that Plato’s view was more consistent with Christianity than Aristotle’s view on the question of God’s supreme sovereignty, is a covert political action on the part of Plethon.⁵⁵⁸ The purpose of the argument was not to argue just for the superiority of Plato over Aristotle, but to negate the claim that

⁵⁵⁵ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 19.

⁵⁵⁶ Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 272-276.; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 6, 8–11.

⁵⁵⁷ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 19. Reflected in the pamphlets (Memoranda) written in 1415 and 1418 to despots Theodore and Emperor Manuel II, concerning how the Empire could be reorganized with political, legal and economic reforms; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 4.

⁵⁵⁸ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 8–11, 192 “Plato’s view that God, the supreme sovereign, is the creator of every kind of intelligible and separate substance, and hence of our entire universe”, while stating that Aristotle, on the other hand, never called God the creator of anything whatsoever, but only the motivating force of the universe.”

Aristotle's philosophical concepts were consistent with Christianity at all. Plethon asserts that Plato is more compatible with Christianity, a stratagem of deliberate political intervention, in order to underline the concept of the Hellene secular state that he sought to promote.⁵⁵⁹

5.3 Plethon's Hellenic Conception

The key component of Plethon's nationalism was "the claim that the Peloponnese, the cradle of the Hellenic genos, had been continuously occupied by Hellenes, and was one point of origin of both the Roman and Constantinopolitan populaces."⁵⁶⁰ Beside its historical connections, Plethon saw the Peloponnese as both fruitful and easy defensible given its topography and the recent fortifications of the Isthmus of Corinth, which in effect converted it into an island."⁵⁶¹

The reason for Plethon's interest in teaching and writing philosophy, astronomy, history, geography and topography, and compiling digests of many classical manuscripts and writers lay in his desire to promote this political aspiration.⁵⁶² Plethon's interest in the Peloponnese stemmed not only from his profession as tutor to its Despot, Theodore II 1407–1428, brother to both Emperor John VIII and later

⁵⁵⁹ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 53, 347; Siniossoglou, *Plato and Theodoret*, 242; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 78.

⁵⁶⁰ N. Patrick Peritore, 'The Political Thought of Gemistos Plethon, A Renaissance Byzantine Reformer', *Polity*, vol. 10. 2, (winter, 1977): 168–191. Plethon argued that the inhabitants of the Peloponnese were the direct descendants of Ancient Greece and propagated "the national 'myth' by calling Hellenes a 'race' or 'genos' and claiming an ethnic continuity". However, the ideological theory of the purity and continuity of the Greek race is repudiated by Peritore, "the inhabitants of ancient, medieval and modern Greece alike were always a congruence of ethnic and linguistic strains".

⁵⁶¹ Ibid. 173; Nicholaos Nicoloudis, 'Laonikos Chalkondyles', *A Translation and Commentary of the Demonstrations of Histories* (Books I-III), introduction, translation and commentaries. Nicholaos Nicoloudis. (Athens: Stefanos D Vasilopoulos, 1996), 344.

⁵⁶² Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 6; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 327.

Emperor Constantine XI, but also when he was banished by their father Emperor Manuel II from Constantinople to Mistra in Morea (Peloponnese).⁵⁶³

In writing the work '*De Differentiis*', Plethon throws light on the purpose of his research concerning a detailed comparison of Plato's and Aristotle's conceptions of God, directing the reader towards the question of Plato's conception of the political state. '*De Differentiis*' was specifically written for the benefit of the Italian humanists, to galvanize interest in Plethon's political ideas.⁵⁶⁴

However, to understand the political implications of Plethon's project, it is important to recognise the process of de-Christianizing Plato within the philosophical context that was taking place. At the time, in terms of the debate about the respective virtues of Plato versus Aristotle, the suggestion that Scholarios could only suspect Plethon of *esoteric ideologies* cannot be realistic, considering the open dissemination of Plethon's support for a de-Christianized secular Hellenistic state. Plethon's exile to Mistra was imposed upon him due to the way he promoted his ideology openly amongst his students.⁵⁶⁵

An examination of Bessarion's eulogy for Plethon supports the claim that Plethon's interest in "esoteric ideologies" was actually well-known⁵⁶⁶. As Bessarion's letter emphasizes, the duplicity of having an Orthodox funeral for Plethon, when his pagan sympathies were known by his former pupils, demonstrated the indifference of certain

⁵⁶³ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 406. For "when he sought to implant his ideals among his pupils" the conception of creating a kingdom under the norms of the secular Hellenistic state did "constitute a call to the secularisation of the state, based on the imperatives of natural religion".

⁵⁶⁴ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 217.

⁵⁶⁵ E. Moutsopoulos & Leonidas K. Mpartzeliotis, *Platonism and Aristotelism According to Plethon: Research from the international Symposium in Sparta*, 26-28 September. (Athens: Idryma Ereynis kai Ekdoseon Neoellinikis Filiosofias, 1987), 152-153; John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998), 116.

⁵⁶⁶ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 83.

elites within the imperial bureaucracy to Plethon's esoteric philosophical concepts and propensities.

Considering Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos had earlier had Plethon confined to Mistra, (though he remained something of a celebrity), attests to the knowledge at that time of Plethon's esoteric disposition, which amounted to heresy. Moreover, Plethon's relationship with Emperor Manuel II is evident, due to his appointment to the court by the Emperor as 'General Judge'—even though the same Emperor exiled Plethon to Mistra—and as chief magistrate by Despot Theodore. While he was in Mistra, the views attributed to him were overlooked, giving rise to a general indifference. An outstanding example is the fact that Plethon was nominated to attend the Council of Florence by Emperor John VIII Palaiologos, which stands in total contradiction to the action of the Emperor's father, Emperor Manuel II, in exiling Plethon to Mistra. It substantiates the confusing cycle of approval and disapproval. Plethon's nomination confirms the esteemed position that he held in the Byzantine Empire.

The general attitude of indifference constitutes some duplicity on the part of Plethon's former students, the Imperial Authority and Scholarios as well. Since Scholarios was constantly corresponding with Plethon's former students he must have known about Plethon's political sympathies. Scholarios' claim that his suspicions were confirmed in receiving the Book of Laws after Plethon's death is therefore somewhat disingenuous. The latest research confirms a general knowledge about Plethon's political sympathies, and that his desire to establish a Hellenistic secular state was acknowledged well before the period of Scholarios' correspondence with Plethon.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶⁷ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 420; Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 183.

According to Siniossoglou, Plethon endeavoured to interpret “a modern approach to ancient philosophy that was a reaction to the Renaissance philosophy, rather than its continuation. Plethon anticipates not Renaissance Platonism, but the modern call for a novel reception of ancient philosophy.”⁵⁶⁸ The move to interpret philosophy in terms of contemporary concerns was initiated due to political necessity. The recent systematic dominance of the Ottoman Turks was an attempt to find a way to secure a stable political state; for Scholarios, the the Council of Florence was a major criterion for this ambition. Plethon sought to establish a political state, a new Hellene state, without the dominance of Constantinople and its implications and, according to Siniossoglou, the influence of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. The future Plethon perceived for this new state in the Peloponnese did not require the “Christian oikonomia” that the capital of Constantinople adhered to and sustained.⁵⁶⁹

Plethon's determination to introduce a pioneering approach to Plato but also to Aristotle was the impetus for his innovative philosophical approach to Hellenistic ontological concepts, as Siniossoglou continues to affirm. “The Plethonean effort to reform the way in which Plato and Aristotle were thought of by Palamites in the East and Thomists in the West was fuelled by the firm belief that Platonism was possible only as paganism. Plethon signals the first consistent de-Christianisation of Platonic ontology, one that was subsequently suppressed by Ficino and Renaissance philosophers. It is not a *Plato Christianus* but a *Plato Paganus* that he is echoing. Plethon’s interpretation of Plato mirrored the pagan Platonism of Celsus and Julian and broke with moderate or mainstream Platonism as introduced by Plotinus and late Neoplatonists.” Affirming the

⁵⁶⁸ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 420; Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 269-270. See: Hladký does not agree that Plethon directly advocates polytheism but the accusation is fostered by conservative Christian minds.

⁵⁶⁹ Gill Page, *Being Byzantine*, 52–55; Georges Florovsky, *Creation and Redemption* vol.3. (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976), 31-33,232.

concept of a philosophical “symphonia” between Plato and Aristotle, “the Renaissance Platonists effectively de-railed the Plethonean project of de-Christianising Plato”.⁵⁷⁰ The process of “de-Christianising Plato” entailed the re-establishing of a state in guardianship of the ideals of a reconstructed Plato, as perceived by Plethon, to perpetuate Plato’s true legacy. The most obvious example of Plethon’s aspiration “is in the two Memoranda or pamphlets addressed respectively to Despot Theodore and Emperor Manuel II. Plethon conveyed a radical socio-political reformist plan, one that was largely inspired by Plato and is suggestive of modern utopianism”.⁵⁷¹

The divergence of views in Plethon and Scholarios’ own individual political perceptions of an ideal state are conspicuous. Siniossoglou again conclusively illustrates this, stating in reference to Gregory Palamas theologically defining Hesychasm; “Palamas and Plethon were conscious of the irreducible difference between Hellenism and Judaeo-Christianity as conflicting world views”.⁵⁷² It is instructive that Scholarios honours Gregory Palamas with a Canon and subsequently notes his theological affirmation of Palamas in his works, suggesting where Scholarios’ sympathies lay. In the *Complete Works*, Volumn I, of Scholarios’ Panegyric sermons, he states the threatening heretical doctrines that Barlaam and Akindynos were asserting by the method of delusional arguments.⁵⁷³ Again in Volume IV in his dedicatory Canon to Palamas he defends and honours Palamas. In the initial beginning of *the Canon* honours Gregory Palamas he addresses him as follows: “*you (Palamas) are enlightened because of the Holy Spirit*”and designates the opponents of Palamas and Hesychasm, that is

⁵⁷⁰ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 419.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid.

⁵⁷² Ibid.

⁵⁷³ Scholarios, ‘Antibarlaamite Polemic’, vol.III. 204-239. It is clear that in dedicating a thirty five page response to the errors of Barlaam and Akindynos, that Scholarios is advancing a strong defence of Palamas, since Barlaam and Akindynos were both in opposition to Palamas’ support of the doctrinal issue of Hesychasm.

Barlaam and Akindynos as “argumentable delusions” and “threatening heresies”. Additionally, in his Canon in honour of Palamas, mentioned above, Scholarios describes Barlaam as “babbler, nonsensical/absurd” and Akindynos as “dangerous” “very dangerous”⁵⁷⁴ To devote a significant element of his work to honouring Palamas would suggest Scholarios’ philosophical and theological views were congruent with those of Palamas.

Scholarios sought a political remedy to the growing threat of the Ottoman Turks, in a manner similar to Kydonis in 1354, but this also applied to Plethon. Each had their own specific approach to the problem of the Ottoman Turks. Kydonis sought his in the alliances with Latins, Scholarios sought to redeem the imperial ideology of imperial and Christian *oikonomia*, and Plethon sought to advance his view of a Hellenistic/secular state. What is noticeable is that both Plethon and Scholarios were to repeat Kydonis’ adjunction to reconstruct the Empire,⁵⁷⁵ even though Plethon also advanced other notions, apart from those that were perceived by the imperial authorities. One constant concern that nurtured all three individuals’ national interests was the sense that it was necessary to halt the advance of the Ottoman Turks.⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷⁴ Scholarios, ‘Sermons and Panegyrics-Sermon for the Feast of Sunday of Orthodoxy’, [Sermon pour la fête de L’Orthodoxie], vol.I. 118; Scholarios, ‘Poetic Works-Canon in honour of Gregory Palamas,’ [Canon en l’honneur de Grégoire Palamas], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 395; Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence’, vol.VI. 282; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 100. Scholarios is metaphorically using the name Akindynos and associating it with dangerous; however Akindynos actually translates as *not dangerous*, as kindynos in Greek means *dangerous*.

⁵⁷⁵ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 419.

⁵⁷⁶ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 137; Scholarios, ‘Speech at Florence on the Religious Question’, [Discours à Florence sur la question religieuse], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 296; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 419.

5.4 Inference in the Texts of *‘De Differentiis’* and *‘Nomoi’*.

In the text of *‘De Differentiis’* itself, Plethon considers the Platonic concept of God to be closer to the Christian concept than that of Aristotle.⁵⁷⁷ This is not as self-evident as he claims. We can see this in particular when we consider that the work of *‘De Differentiis’* replicates his *‘Summary of Zoroaster and Plato’*, which implies the pagan undercurrents of his beliefs.⁵⁷⁸

However, the subsequent dispute between Plethon and Scholarios indicates that Plethon does adamantly emphasize the superiority of one over the other. Even though Scholarios advocates respect for the philosophical concepts of Plato, this is rather disingenuous given the evidence that has been presented.⁵⁷⁹ In furthering his response to Plethon on the subject of eternity and creator, Scholarios does not respond using philosophical ideas from Aristotelian philosophy but from the perspective of a Christian standpoint,⁵⁸⁰ citing nothing from Plato's account of the subject of eternity, for it is very vague.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷⁷ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 192. In comparing Aristotle's and Plato's conceptions of God, Plethon argues that Plato attributes God with more exalted powers as “creator of every kind of intelligible and separate substance, and hence of our entire universe, while Aristotle has Him as only the motive force of the universe. Whereas Plato's God is also the end and final cause of existence, Aristotle does emphasize God as the end and the final cause; but even this must be regarded as a not very exalted claim and not one worthy of God, if he makes God the end not of existence or essences of particular things but only of movement and change”.

⁵⁷⁸ De Bolt, ‘George Gemistos Plethon on God: Heterodoxy in Defence of Orthodoxy’, Introduction.

⁵⁷⁹ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 244. The suggestion is that Plato “confused all the disciplines and it was left to Aristotle to distinguish them”, although Scholarios continues to affirm that although “Aristotle’s approach to philosophy may be less attractive than Plato’s, its rigorous distinction of different disciplines was a major advance of which Plato was incapable.”

⁵⁸⁰ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol.IV.20.v29. “He at once tacitly recognizes that the clarity of Aristotle’s view on eternity does not make it consistent with Christianity, but rather the contrary. Not having the benefit of divine inspiration, Aristotle could not invariably be right. Christians believe that the world began in time, but they owe this belief to the inspiration of God, not to the wisdom or teaching of men”.

⁵⁸¹ Scholarios, ‘Pastoral and Ascetical Works’, [Œuvres pastorales et ascétiques], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 245.

In his discussion of the topic of inspiration, Scholarios omits to mention that Aristotle was not writing theologically but philosophically, which is not relevant to revelation and therefore can be seen to have limitations in this context. “God exercises His power over the human soul by inspiration”.⁵⁸² In addition, when Scholarios does resort to responding by using Aristotelian sources, his response is by “quoting passages from the *Physics* and the *Metaphysics* to illustrate that Aristotle did recognize that eternal things could have causes”.⁵⁸³

The complexity of the analysis of the terms eternity and creator and their causes, aims to shed light on, not Aristotle’s view, but the Christian view, which is determined by the use of Aristotelian philosophical terminologies. This would suggest Scholarios is alluding here to Plethon’s heretical implications. Disparaging remarks from either side about the other are evident, aiming to demonstrate that their particular philosopher was more consistent with the Christian concept of God. This can be seen fundamentally as a political disagreement, especially when their illustrations did not actually confirm or elucidate their arguments.

At the beginning of his ‘Defence,’ Scholarios deviates from the subject of his response to Plethon, and when he endeavours to respond to Plethon’s remarks on Aristotle, he responds without giving adequate substance to the argument. Scholarios does affirm that Aristotle is sometimes obscure and adds that this is a mark of a true philosopher, stating that Aristotle’s obscurity would have been made clearer if heard from the

⁵⁸² Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’ vol.IV.22v10–16 and 25. v.32–26.5

⁵⁸³ Scholarios, ‘Translation of the pamphlet ‘fallaciis’ of St. Thomas Aquinas’, [Traduction de l’opuscule ‘De fallaciis’ de saint Thomas d’Aquin], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VIII.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936), 252. v34. The column is totally based on the subject of *Physics*; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 246.

original source, which would reveal Aristotle's '*veiled meaning*'.⁵⁸⁴ However, Plethon is also unsuccessful in his endeavour to demonstrate his argument that, if there is no creation of the universe, there is no productive cause of it either. Aristotle's lack of clarification of the Prime Cause or Motion seems for Plethon to confirm the validity of Plato's arguments but he provides no substantial argument for the contrary view.⁵⁸⁵

Scholarios' remarks contain no explication of Aristotle's obscure claims, which are devoid of substantial evidence to support and give credence to Aristotle, thus weakening the argument against Plethon. This explains why Plethon is able to assert the superiority of Plato over Aristotle. In summary, Plethon and Scholarios were intent on surpassing one another, each advancing their arguments without tangible proof.

In Petit's introduction to Scholarios' work in defence of Aristotle, Petit comments that Scholarios' apology for Aristotle is the most significant feature; uniquely responding to Plethon's complaint, namely that Aristotle does not state what Plethon interprets in his work to be creation by God or the Prime Motion of the universe.⁵⁸⁶ However, the notion of the Prime Mover is recognized by Scholarios' in his affirmation that God is the first principle of the universe, which signifies He is the creator. Scholarios thus refutes Plethon's assertion that Aristotle fails to attribute the creation of the universe to God. "According to Aquinas, anything changed or moved is changed or moved by

⁵⁸⁴ Scholarios, 'On the First Service of God', [Sur le Premier service de Dieu], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 242.

⁵⁸⁵ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV.10; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 243, 192. Plethon is not attributing to Aristotle that God is the final cause, if he makes God the end not of the existence or essence of particular things but only of movement and change". This is reinforced in the interpretation of the topic *ex nihilo*, where he argues that to say Plato's God is a creator *ex nihilo* is misconstruing the matter, even when Plethon's depiction of Aristotle's view is correct; Rowe, *Philosophy of Religion*, 81.

⁵⁸⁶ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon' vol.IV. First Book, 10–11.

something else (*Omne quod movetur ab alio movetur*)”and thus is the cause.⁵⁸⁷

Scholarios states the universe and the heavens *rely* on God, meaning they must have been created by God.⁵⁸⁸

Scholarios resolutely defends Aristotle against Plethon's interpretation, retorting directly to his arguments. He is responding not only to what Petit suggests is a concern about the methodological approach.⁵⁸⁹ A careful reading of Plethon's work on the *Summary of Zoroaster and Plato*, suggests he thinks the Universe is eternal, but also again strongly emphasizes the question of who created the universe.⁵⁹⁰ However, the arguments about the eternity of the universe and who created it are a device hiding the real point Plethon wants to make; underlying his argument is his belief of the ancient Hellenistic Olympian gods. It is apparent that the criticism of Aristotle is a manoeuvre to attempt to lessen the influence of Aristotle, who had come to symbolize the preceptor in Christian theology. In his attempt to rebut Plethon, Scholarios quotes Aquinas; for Scholarios, the accusation inherent in Plethon's '*heretical*' attack against Aristotle is fundamentally an attack on Aquinas⁵⁹¹, and if so, then in Scholarios' opinion, it is a subversive attack on Christianity and on the Christian context of *oikonomia*.

⁵⁸⁷ Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 28.

⁵⁸⁸ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV.27 v22–35; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 246.

⁵⁸⁹ Scholarios, 'Introduction', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), vol.IV.iii–iv, 10.

⁵⁹⁰ De Bolt, 'George Gemistos Plethon on God'. De Bolt section number 5 of the Summary paper.

"Concerning the universe, first that this Universe is eternal. Both the second ranking and the third ranking gods are in it. This universe was begotten by Zeus; it was neither begun in time nor will it come to an end."

⁵⁹¹ Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 29. Davies suggests that Plethon had no preference for scholastic theology, while Aquinas was a product of this system of thought; Kianka, *Dimitrios Cydones*, 196. Aristotelian philosophy had become integrally associated with the theological writings of Thomas Aquinas and anyone who aspired to the study of Aristotelian philosophy was introduced to the works of Aquinas. Both Kydonis and Scholarios had excelled in the studies of Aristotelian philosophy and also in the study of the philosophical and theological works of Thomas Aquinas.

5.5 Contentious Assertions

Scholarios' introductory salutation to Plethon in Book One on the '*Defence of Aristotle*' is very cordial and addresses Plethon with great dignity; a letter to Plethon dated 1450 also confirms this apparently affable approach. However, this is deceptively genial, when we consider his rebuttal of Plethon in the letter, and in light of the '*Defence of Aristotle*' between the years 1443 and 1445,⁵⁹² emphasizing his rather more disparaging approach to Plethon's work.⁵⁹³ For instance, "he (Scholarios) told others that whatever skill Gemistos had in philosophy had been put 'at the service of evil prejudice". He also called him a weak minded person who does not know or understand Aristotelian logic.⁵⁹⁴ The attack by Scholarios is a response to the anti-Christian sentiments expressed in the '*Memoranda*', which implies the same reasoning as the '*Nomoi*'.⁵⁹⁵

Augustine's argument "affirming that of all philosophers Platonists are closer to Christianity" is not questionable, given that the "dangerous opponent" is most often the one closest to you.⁵⁹⁶ Plethon addresses Scholarios particularly acrimoniously concerning his delay in sending Plethon his work on the '*Defence of Aristotle*', but he is, in fact, apprehensive, as is reflected in his response to the '*Memoranda*'. As observed in the '*Differentiis*', "Plethon had no difficulty in maintaining the Augustinian

⁵⁹² Scholarios, 'Letter to Gemistos Plethon about his Book against the Latins', [Lettre à Gémistos Pléthon à propos de son ouvrage contre les Latins], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 118; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius', 430.

⁵⁹³ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol IV. 1–4.

⁵⁹⁴ Scholarios, 'Letter to the Princess of the Peloponnese 'on Treaty Law' of Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 152. v23–4.

⁵⁹⁵ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 406.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid. 408–409.

theory of proximity between Platonism and Christianity in a calculated attempt to undermine the philosophical foundations of Eastern Orthodoxy from within”.⁵⁹⁷

Scholarios is accused of pretending to have already sent his work on the ‘*Defence of Aristotle*’ to Plethon, when in fact he had delayed sending it. The delay is attributed to Mark Eugenikos, as Scholarios wanted him to review the work prior to sending it to Plethon, but this resulted in him concealing the real reason from Plethon by lying about it.⁵⁹⁸ The complexity of the real situation that prompted Scholarios to lie, results in a portrayal of Scholarios as a conspicuously wily political character.⁵⁹⁹ Just as Plethon intuitively recognizes this persona of Scholarios’, so Scholarios recognizes this persona of Plethon. There is a political dimension to the acrimonious exchanges between the two men. Scholarios knows Plethon’s political aspirations and the political circumstances from which his manipulative behaviour arises.

However, Plethon’s own observations about Scholarios are blunt and to the point, in terms of his allegations about Scholarios’ lying. The allegations could be considered justifiable, particularly as they relate to Plethon’s own political interests. Scholarios’ pretence of sending his ‘*Defence of Aristotle*’ when he had in fact delayed it, even though it was ostensibly because he wanted Mark Eugenikos to view the work, does seem to demonstrate a degree of political manoeuvring on his own part. Plethon’s savage portrayal of Scholarios continues as follows: “for along with your other faults,

⁵⁹⁷ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol.IV. 1–10.

⁵⁹⁸ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283. To continue his chastisement of Scholarios for lying about recently receiving his work, Plethon writes; “on the contrary, I sent you a copy as soon as it was requested, pertaining to Plethon’s work, *De differentiis*. You on the other hand, had persistently delayed sending me a copy of your *Defence of Aristotle* in spite of many requests. You even pretended to have sent me a copy when in fact you had not done so for, along with your other faults, lying comes naturally to you. Even the text which reached me by clandestine means was incomplete, but it was enough to display your ignorance and intellectual decrepitude”.

⁵⁹⁹ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-the same’, vol.IV.412–18. Letters to individuals pertaining to Scholarios’ political advancement.

lying comes naturally to you”. The words “other faults” refer to the “ignorance and intellectual decrepitude” of Scholarios, which may allude to Scholarios’ political vision, as well as referring disrespectfully to his knowledge and intelligence. Plethon might have observed Scholarios in his earlier years, prior to the Council and in his association with Scholarios at the Council of Florence, and noted his capacity for shrewd political manoeuvring.⁶⁰⁰ This capacity was noted in the proceedings of the Council, particularly in terms of Scholarios’ attitude towards the Filioque Clause.⁶⁰¹

What Plethon is challenging in this context is the credibility of Scholarios as a genuine philosopher and a theologian, despite the weight of evidence confirming Scholarios’ aptitude for these two professions. These remarks by Plethon unambiguously imply that Scholarios is unable to judge any work in these two disciplines or any other, and, above all, describes his character as inconsistent and unreliable, implying he is politically untrustworthy.⁶⁰² It directly attacks Scholarios’ suitability as a credible imperial examiner.

The acrimonious accusation, together with Scholarios’ lie about sending his work, occurred during the Byzantine Empire’s most crucial moment of political weakness. The failure of the West to come to the aid of the Empire, the pro-Union faction leaving for Western shores and, crucially, the complete encirclement of the City of

⁶⁰⁰ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283.

⁶⁰¹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 426.

⁶⁰² Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283; Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 287. It is remembered in the speech of Bessarion 1441-1444, returning to the frame of mind that Scholarios negated in 1436-1437, he explained that the addition was regrettable, but that it was not in his view sufficient reason to cause a schism. The substantive issue was the dogmatic truth of the Filioque and the Council should specifically have the task to rule on this point. This testimony as to the type of union desired by Scholarios shortly before the departure of the Byzantines for Italy, whether or not a dogmatic union, is essential to understanding the future position of the latter during the Council itself, and is a reflection of Scholarios’ political sway.

Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks all rendered the Byzantine Empire weak.⁶⁰³ There could not have been a better time to expedite their visions for the future of the Byzantine Empire, as the implications of all these exchanges between Plethon and Scholarios suggest. Scholarios' letter to Exarch Joseph, written a few years after Plethon's death in 1456, when 'reputably' exact knowledge of Plethon's notion of polytheistic ontology had become evident, shows Scholarios pronouncing that Plethon was utterly simple-minded and unable to distinguish truth from falsehood,⁶⁰⁴ as Woodhouse notes: "There is a perpetual ambivalence in everything he wrote about Plethon".⁶⁰⁵ On the one hand, he expressed admiration for his learning and moral qualities; on the other hand, he accused him of heresy and blasphemy. He addressed Plethon as 'best and wisest of friends' and yet vilifies him to extremes.⁶⁰⁶ In the same letter of 1456, Scholarios clearly recognises Plethon's aspiration, namely, the Hellene nation state that Plethon envisaged in the Peloponnese, which would suggest a reason for the unfriendly address.⁶⁰⁷ This would suggest recognition of their mutually incompatible visions for the future of the Byzantine State.⁶⁰⁸

When Plethon articulates his diverse philosophical and polytheistic beliefs, he avoids giving the work a title. Scholarios asserts and indicates Plethon's openly revealing (δηλος) propensity to his endeavour. This may have been to consciously avoid the

⁶⁰³ See above footnote 79 of this thesis with reference to Manuel Chrysoloras, P.G.156, and 24B- 60B. As repeated in the above footnote 79, there are biographical details of Chrysoloras, his relationship with Dimitrios Kydonis and his close friendship with Emperor Manuel II, also his being sent as an envoy by the emperor to Italy so as to obtain aid for Constantinople against the Ottoman Turks.

⁶⁰⁴ Scholarios, 'Summary against the Gentiles', vol. V. 180; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 38; Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 250.

⁶⁰⁵ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 4; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 241.

⁶⁰⁶ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Pethon', vol.IV.118 v30.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid. 155 v.33.

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid. 180; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 38.

consequences and reactions to this work,⁶⁰⁹ and yet Scholarios had addressed Plethon as the “*best and wisest of friends*”.⁶¹⁰ The sudden change from civil cordiality to rebuttal indicates Scholarios is aware of the dangerous implications for the Christian faith and its consequence towards the state,⁶¹¹ and is also aware of Plethon’s political endeavours to re-vitalize a Hellene state with secular guidelines.⁶¹²

This may be the reason for Scholarios’ derogatory comment about Plethon. Livanos attributes Scholarios with a syncretic outlook, noting his ability to adapt to and accommodate various philosophical and theological concepts, while simultaneously applying the theological rigor of Scholastic philosophy, but also the simple piety of the early Church. The implication of the simple piety of the early Church is a direct referral to the imperial Authority and its duties to the Christian concept of *oikonomia*. It is in terms of this political ecclesiastical concept that Scholarios diverges from Plethon.⁶¹³

We know that Plethon had a certain distaste for Latin scholasticism. The two individuals perceived the necessary reconstruction of the Imperial state from two necessarily opposing viewpoints: one Imperial/ecclesiastical and the other secular/Hellenistic.⁶¹⁴ This is the context for the divergence. Therefore we may conclude that Scholarios’ and Plethon’s political aspirations were the cause of the dichotomous relationship between them.

⁶⁰⁹ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Pethon’, vol.IV.180 v 31.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid. 152 v23–4; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 38–39.

⁶¹¹ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Pethon’, vol.IV.68.

⁶¹² Ibid. 152 v23–4.

⁶¹³ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 76.

⁶¹⁴ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 62.

5.6 Defence of the Byzantine Identity

As Petit notes, Scholarios' *'Defence of Aristotle'* is designed to rebut Plethon's pamphlet titled *'De Differentiis'*. The first book of Scholarios' work responds to the first four chapters of Plethon's work,⁶¹⁵ and outlines the reason for Scholarios' defence of Aristotle. As noted by Turner; "Scholarios saw this work (*'De Differentiis'*) as an attack on Aristotle, and the truth". The use of the word "truth" is pertinent; it would seem to refer only to Aristotle, but it also refers to Christianity.⁶¹⁶ Turner explains how this attack on the authority of Aristotle implies an attack on the Christian faith, since Thomas Aquinas' deployment of Aristotelian philosophy illuminates the theological perspective of the Roman Church.⁶¹⁷ "Scholarios did not only advocate the absorbance of the advances made by Western scholarship, for Aristotle was no longer merely the master of elementary and basic sciences; he was to be the guide in all sciences and even a preceptor in theology".⁶¹⁸

If Aristotelian philosophy is to be considered preceptorial, particularly of Western theology, it is because this philosophy had such a direct impact on the theological speculations of Aquinas; hence to attack Aristotle was to attack Christianity. "According to Kydonis, Aquinas had surpassed all other theologians and his works were filled with lofty thought and persuasive reasoning". This conviction was also shared by Scholarios, who expressed the same sentiments and convictions, even though "Scholarios translated most of Aquinas' theological works whereas Kydonis remained in the admiration of philosophical terminologies found in theological works of

⁶¹⁵ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.IV. iii.

⁶¹⁶ Ibid. 5, 36.

⁶¹⁷ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 430.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid.

Aquinas.”⁶¹⁹ Scholarios like “Kydonis, appreciated Aquinas’ philosophical manner of proceeding and its articulation of faith and reason,”⁶²⁰ although Scholarios was to change from the study of the philosophical works of Aquinas to very extensive theological exegesis of Aquinas’ works from 1444 onwards.⁶²¹ It is unsurprising, considering the close correlation of Scholarios with Kydonis in their shared enthusiasm for Aquinas, that Scholarios would agree with Kydonis on the question of Aristotle and Plato’s relative importance. Kydonis considered Aristotle superior to Plato due to the lack of clarity in Plato’s work.⁶²² If we are right to assume Scholarios sees Aristotle’s and Aquinas’ works as forms of exegesis of Christian dogma, then we can surmise that his response to Plethon’s work on ‘*De Differentiis*’ is a defence of these beliefs.

In terms of this inference then, Scholarios was not concerned about the philosophical context of Plethon, but the appropriation of philosophy to foster an ideology that was contrary to Christianity, for his assertion is, regarding Plethon’s use of philosophy, that “he placed them at the service of evil prejudice”.⁶²³ When we consider the words “*evil prejudice*”, we see they could only really have one meaning: the intention to create a revitalized Hellenistic or secular view, and one that seeks to disarm Orthodoxy.⁶²⁴

⁶¹⁹ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydonis*, 118; Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence-To Matthew Kamariotis’, vol.VI. 179-180.

⁶²⁰ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydonis*, 119.

⁶²¹ Ibid. 136.

⁶²² Ibid. 122.

⁶²³ Scholarios, ‘Polemic against Gemistos Plethon’, vol.IV.39.

⁶²⁴ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, Epilogue, 423. In an “observational study of Plethon on the Platonic and Aristotelian concept of Being, he turned against the equivocality of Being and established a unified ontology that challenged the most fundamental Christian Orthodox doctrine: that there is no community, nor similarity, nor even anything resembling a possible ontological analogy between created substance and the uncreated essence of god. In both cases the transcendence of the Judaeo-Christian godhead is abolished and nature is rendered ontologically connected to god. Plethon develops an essentially Stoic deterministic world-view, according to which to be free means to synchronise with necessity”. The application of this philosophical concept by Plethon has a sinister implication that Scholarios was quick to annunciate in his attack on Plethon’s concept of philosophy.

The Greek word φαυλα (stupid-nonsense) is used to describe the absurdity of Plethon's work, not just the recently revealed work 'On Laws', but the whole premise of Plethon's theories and evaluations of Plato and his attacks on Aristotle.⁶²⁵ Scholarios uses the same term in describing the stupidity of Akindynos and Balaam when attacking their rebuttal of Gregory Palamas's theological concept of Hesychasm.⁶²⁶ This seemingly illustrates what has been suggested so far, Hellenism in the confines of polytheistic ontology (that is, as Plethon promotes it), contains an *irreducible difference* from Christianity and the concept of *oikonomia*, as understood by the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine Empire).⁶²⁷

Hence in this correspondence we see Scholarios' grasps Plethon's approach to philosophy, and enunciate his suspicions of his polytheistic propensities.⁶²⁸ However, Plethon responds with his opinion of Scholarios' true political character by using an analogy, when he writes; "the example set by Simplicius' criticism of the Church is really applicable to you, 'since you are often in a state of schism within yourself'".⁶²⁹ Plethon's use of this analogy is revealing, since it reinforces an image of Scholarios as duplicitous or divided, a description that Scholarios himself applies indirectly to Plethon.

Scholarios considers Aristotle the greatest of ancient philosophers, and claims that "*he was the one compatible with Christian doctrine*".⁶³⁰ This remark is made in Scholarios'

⁶²⁵ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV. 156 v19.

⁶²⁶ Ibid. 204.

⁶²⁷ Siniossoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 419.

⁶²⁸ Scholarios, 'Letter to the Exarch Joseph on the Book by Gemistos Plethon and against Pagan Polytheism', [Lettre à l'exarque Joseph sur le livre de Gémistos Pléthon et contre le polythéisme païen], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 156, v 19; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 7–9.

⁶²⁹ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 283.

⁶³⁰ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 71.

letter to the Exarch Joseph, where he undertakes the defence of Aristotle, not so much for the love of philosophy, but as a defence of the Christian religion.⁶³¹ Petit confirms this as a key point in Scholarios' response to Plethon: "[Plethon is] already known as a critic of Aristotle, he had composed a book that was offensive to Christianity and wanted nothing less than to resurrect the old Greco-Roman Paganism and substitute the gods of Olympus for Christ".⁶³²

In Scholarios' *'Defence of Aristotle'*, a major part of his work purposely relates to the salvific act of Christ's redemption. This would imply that Scholarios was not concerned with the philosophical contents of Plethon's deliberations against Aristotle, but, rather, the theological/political implications. Petit confirms that Scholarios was certainly only too aware that Plethon advocated *substituting the gods of Olympus for Christ*, which would constitute the re-establishment of a pagan or secular state in place of the imperial Christian state. As Petit writes; "Plethon consulted various imperial individuals on political themes that were not philosophical topics, for politics was no less important a subject than philosophy in the minds of Plethon and his royal correspondents".⁶³³ Plethon may well have been a keen advocate of the pagan ideas of the past. Yet contemporary research suggests he could also have been a good Orthodox Christian. This view is reinforced when we examine biographical accounts by Plethon's contemporaries, showing they regarded him as such and interpreted his book 'On Laws' as a literary and philosophical exercise in keeping with philosophical tradition.⁶³⁴ In support of this view Vojtěch Hladký argues that "Renaissance Humanists were equally

⁶³¹ Scholarios, 'Letter to the Exarch Joseph on the Book by Gemistos Plethon and against Pagan Polytheism', vol.IV. 155–7.

⁶³² Ibid. 'Introduction', vol.IV.iii–iv.

⁶³³ Woodhouse, George *Gemistos Plethon*, 88.

⁶³⁴ Maria Mauroudi, 'Plethon as Subversive and his Reception in the Islamic World' in *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*, eds. Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby, Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publication 17. (Surrey England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013), 178.

adaptable, effectively demonstrating the spirit of a time when Christianity could be combined with a personal religious approach to the ancient past. This mode of thought of the *quattrocento* humanists, in which Plethon's work is probably also to be counted, was appropriately called 'the pagan dream of the Renaissance', that is, a medium or a discourse in which the ancient gods could be brought back into the life by the Renaissance authors. Nonetheless, they did not become pagans themselves, but retained their Christian faith, at least on the most important points".⁶³⁵ However, we may be left wondering at what point in this endeavour of re-invigorating the ancient past did Plethon cease to endorse pagan deities and embrace the Christian faith, particularly when he issued his work of 'On Laws' in the later part of his life.⁶³⁶

The scope of this philosophical interest is clear, for the intention is identified, as Petit states, by those who read the few "chapters of the mysterious book '*On Laws*' that has long been discussed but is yet to be published. Plethon is summoned to vindicate himself, or to remove the mask. His silence camouflages his real endeavours, which, if revealed, will compromise him by articulating his strategy".⁶³⁷ Scholarios perceived the implications of Plethon's attack on Aristotle, which are reflected in the words "for evil intentions".

Plethon's words are decisive; "Everything depends on getting right the political system. For no other cause of cities faring well or badly exists except the establishment of a good or bad political system".⁶³⁸ As Livanos writes, referring to an anonymous admirer of Plethon who stated the following about Scholarios: "Unable to refute or dismantle what was written, if indeed he found anything disagreeable therein, especially

⁶³⁵ Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 281.

⁶³⁶ Mauroudi, 'Pletho as Subversive and his Reception in the Islamic World', 177.

⁶³⁷ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.IV.iii-iv.

⁶³⁸ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 93.

concerning Hellenic religion and theology, he acted like those who spoke against Porphyry, Julian and others. Consumed by envy and having found an opportunity, he destroyed it by fire as he oozed the venom he had always fostered against me.”⁶³⁹

On reflection, even though the author is anonymous and the entry is dated after Plethon’s death, there are significant observations in the above criticism, apart from the calumnious attack on Scholarios. The mention of a Hellenistic (pagan) ontology emphasizes the interest in paganism and the possibility of re-establishing it, if this ontology was part of Plethon’s political endeavours.

5.7 State and Oikonomia

Having written pamphlets to Despot Theodore and Emperor Manuel II in 1415 and 1418 describing how the Empire could be reorganized, Plethon remains consistent in his political objectives.⁶⁴⁰ The political, legal and economic reforms that Plethon suggests in these pamphlets are repeated, in particular, in his expositions of Plato’s work. The invitation by a few Florentine humanists to articulate Plato’s theory of a republic certainly did not fall on deaf ears, but on the ears of those who already strongly advocated the concept of a republic, as was to be seen in Florence and Venice.⁶⁴¹ The provisional schools that lectured on the difference between Plato and Aristotle, actually nurtured Plato’s theory and vision of the state, and none more so than Plethon (in his own version).⁶⁴²

⁶³⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 82.

⁶⁴⁰ George T. Dennis, *An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Manuel II Palaeologus 1425* by Matthew (monk). In *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides*, (Aldershot England : Ashgate. 2003), 423-441.

⁶⁴¹ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 719; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 99, 109.

⁶⁴² Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 347; Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 87–88.

Creating a Hellene nation in the manner suggested by Plato was never far from Plethon's mind, particularly when, after the Ottoman conquest in the Peloponnese in 1440, he “was looking forward to a day when a Greek king and his successors would unite to administer their own affairs and form a nation”.⁶⁴³ Having barely returned from Florence, Plethon made this remark about establishing a Hellenic nation, which indicates the main purpose in his philosophical and political endeavours.

Scholarios' suspicions about Plethon's orthodoxy and credibility as defender of the Byzantine Empire had already been raised by his (Scholarios') knowledge of Plethon's work concerning the creation of a Hellene nation well before 1438. Scholarios, in particular, was concerned about the implications of this, as he believed Plethon to be in the service of evil intentions.

The term Roman or Rhomaioi connotes the historical use of the term as known by the people of the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine Empire). It was intrinsically united with the theological and historical use of the term, but is also tied to the word *oikonomia* in the Orthodox theological implication of the word, whereas 'Hellenes' is definitely used as a pagan association, primarily from Julian the Apostate in the fifth century, and its reuse by Plethon carries this implication, because he was advocating a renewed polytheistic or secular Hellene nation.

In inserting his views on a Hellenistic state into his works '*Memoranda*', '*De Differentiis*' and '*On Laws*', Plethon is disavowing the claims of the Roman Imperial world state, which appears to be in its last throes, and advocating instead the nationalistic exclusivity he declares as a Hellene state. The crucial argument between Scholarios and Plethon concerns their differing versions of how the post-Byzantine

⁶⁴³ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 109.

Greeks ought to incorporate aspects of their Hellenic heritage into the construction of a Greek identity in the absence of the Roman Empire of the East.⁶⁴⁴

In fact the populace of the Eastern Roman Empire regarded themselves as Hellenes and inheritors of the ancient Hellene as well as the Roman tradition. This heritage is reflected in the use of the title in reference to the Empire and utilized by the Emperors that the Latins purposely discredited. The Latins addressed the Emperor in Constantinople as the *Emperor of the Greeks* and not as *Emperor of the Romans*.⁶⁴⁵ The refusal of the correct appellation for the Emperor or to the empire amounts to a denial of legitimacy by the Latins and implies negative propaganda. The name Eastern Roman Empire (Βασιλεία τῶν Ῥωμαίων) applies to the state in the former Eastern half of the Empire. In fact, no state or empire was ever called Byzantine.

This title Byzantine/Byzantium was defunct due to the renaming of the city as Constantinople or Κωνσταντινούπολη.⁶⁴⁶ In fact, it is an anachronism, alluding to the remote pagan past, prior to 330 AD, when the city was renamed and re-dedicated by Constantine the Great, who gave it his own name.⁶⁴⁷ Moving the capital of the Roman empire from Rome to Constantinople constitutes the visible division with the pagan past

⁶⁴⁴ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 6.

⁶⁴⁵ Andrew J Sopko. *Prophet of Roman Orthodoxy, the Theology of John Romanides*. (Dewdney, B.C.: Synaxis Press, 1998), 95. Even though on numerous occasions Scholarios uses the words Greki or Hellenes in his work, this demonstrates the general deployment and enormous influence by the Latins in the use of these words in the late period of the Eastern Roman society.

⁶⁴⁶ In fact, the inhabitants of Constantinople and their descendants who are Christians or Turkish still refer to themselves as *I Polites or Romioi (Rum)* up to the present day.

⁶⁴⁷ John Julius Norwich, *Byzantium: the Decline and Fall*. (London, New York: Penguin Books, 1995), 224–227, 238–245. In the ninth century, the Carolingians, with a policy of assimilation by means of indoctrination designed to bring uniformity and order, to support and justify their right to lay claim to be the valid successors to the Roman State, extended this same claim to the Church of Rome. With this bogus document and its claim of Romanicity, that is, orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, the West extorted and demanded the subjugation of the East, not only with respect to temporal and doctrinal matters, but also of all ecclesiastical jurisdictions in both West and East. It also helped to form a partisan foundation for the West's approach in its relationship to Constantinople. The Papacy inherited and espoused this claim of supremacy, and often used political and theological terminology that was instigated by the successors of Charlemagne in their dialogue with the Court of Constantinople and particularly at the Council of Florence.

and unity with the Christian faith; thus, the act itself was an image of the Union of the Roman Empire with Christianity—hence the concept of *oikonomia*. The association of the name of Constantinople with Christianity was in contrast to the association of Hellene with paganism.⁶⁴⁸

In Scholarios' work '*Defence of Aristotle*', his defence is centred on the act of redemption in the life, death and resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ. To deny this act is to deny the greatest act of redemption by God to humankind, rejecting the term *oikonomia*, which is the most important aspect of this Christian concept and intrinsically united in the political/theological concept of the Eastern Roman Empire.⁶⁴⁹

It is widely acknowledged that this term is intrinsically affiliated with the word Romaïos/Romaïoi⁶⁵⁰ who were the direct descendants of the Hellenic-Roman traditions and Christianity. Kazhdan and Wharton-Epstein, in their summary, emphasize this point when they write that; "Since then, no Emperor, senate, or band of audacious rebels ever abolished the Roman Empire and introduced in its stead a new Byzantine state."⁶⁵¹

The use of the words Byzantine and Greek is from a Humanistic source and Western perspective; part of the process of the elimination of Christian terms in the emergent identity of the Eastern Roman Empire. This obliteration was intended to legitimize the creation of the established Roman Empire in 800AD as perceived by Charlemagne and

⁶⁴⁸ John S. Romanides, *Franks, Romans, Feudalism and Doctrine: An Interplay between Theology and Society*. (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982).17; Joannes Romanides, *Rommeosyne*, Romaia, Roumeli [Romancity, Roman, Roumeli]. (Thessalonki: Pournares, 1975), 1-10; Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 59.

⁶⁴⁹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 77.

⁶⁵⁰ The terminologies or words Romaïos/Romios are the same, as the latter derives from a layman's tradition of the word Romaïos.

⁶⁵¹ Alexander Petrovich Kazhdan and Annabel Jane Wharton, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985), 1–3; Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (Crestwood, NY : St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982), 310.

his successors, which ultimately became the Holy Roman Empire, and the projection of the words Greki, or Greek, are from contemporary perspectives.⁶⁵²

But above all, the policies of Charlemagne and Western propaganda became the principal factor behind the appellation of Greki or Hellene by the West and about the East, demoting and accusing the Byzantines of being pagan and not Christian.⁶⁵³ Scholarios uses this word 'Greki' numerous times throughout his works, rather than the word Romaioi, and thus demonstrates that the Latin influence was prevalent. This also applies to the use of the words Byzantium or Byzantines, reflecting the subconscious negative attitude of the West toward the East. The sentence structure and semantics related to the use of the word also indicate this undertone of negativity.

Hence, the concept *oikonomia* with reference to the Christian teaching of mystical redemption is destabilized and negated.⁶⁵⁴ Scholarios recognized that Christianity was an integral part of his people's communal existence.⁶⁵⁵ The novel concept of Plethon's Hellenistic nation then had a direct implication of negating the Christian *oikonomia*, and it was Scholarios' awareness of this implication that prompted his remarks referring to Plethon's evil intentions.⁶⁵⁶

Scholarios tried to accommodate to the requirements that were officially prescribed in defending the imperial state, such as it was, and Orthodoxy-Rhomaioisyné and its policy of *oikonomia*.⁶⁵⁷ The emphatic responses by Scholarios and Plethon to each

⁶⁵² Sopko, *Prophet of Roman Orthodoxy*, 110.

⁶⁵³ Pierre Riche, *The Carolingians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 176, 182.

⁶⁵⁴ Kazhdan, 'Oikonomia', in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 1516.

⁶⁵⁵ Michael Doukas, [Μιχαήλ Δούκας] *Byzantine Turkish History [Byzantinoturkike Historia]*, Keimena Byzantines Historiographias.ed. Karalis Vrasidas. (Athens: Ekdoseis Kanake, 1997), 22-23; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 77.

⁶⁵⁶ Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 374; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*,

75.

⁶⁵⁷ Scholarios, 'Polemic against Gemistos Plethon', vol.IV.139.

another cannot be solely due to conflicting philosophical views, but must also reflect the main reason for their antagonism to one another, which was, as Livanos has suggested, the political future of Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine).⁶⁵⁸

De Bolt's conclusions about Plethon's arguments in '*De Differentiis*' against Aristotle's conception of God also confirms the political motivations for his work, for he states; "*De Differentiis*, when compared to his position in his *Summary*, reveals that those two positions are, in fact, consistent with one another and not with any Christian conception whatever".⁶⁵⁹ The '*Summary*' supports the concept of Hellene, as is clearly demonstrated, and since it was consistent with '*De Differentiis*' then Plethon's claim that this work supported Christian theological concepts is false.⁶⁶⁰ As Plethon advances his philosophical perspective concerning the establishment of a Hellene nation, it embodies a procedure of paganism as its foundation.⁶⁶¹

Throughout his life, Plethon utilized all means at his disposal to expedite his philosophical convictions, as reflected in his '*Memoranda*' in 1415–18. He utilized his lectures in Florence as a way to lay the foundations for the spread of his esoteric

⁶⁵⁸ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 78.

⁶⁵⁹ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 11, 39; Siniosoglou, *Radical Platonism in Byzantium*, 306; Hladký, *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon*, 283; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Theology and Philosophy in Byzantium*, 64. The example of Plethon's *Reply* written shortly thereafter articulates the reason for this adversarial correspondence. In his *Reply*, Plethon often stresses his belief that Plato is more consistent with Christian doctrine than Aristotle. What is odd about this sentence is that Plethon had no time for Christianity, as he perceived all "theological issues were ranked very low in the order of priorities". This statement is apparently throwing light on the person of Plethon, who was a great exponent of Platonic philosophy but apathetic regarding religion, particularly as he was indifferent to doctrinal matters and Christianity, "for he saw it as doomed."

⁶⁶⁰ Ibid. 284–293.

⁶⁶¹ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 82, 85. Plethon believed in the supremacy of philosophy over theology, and strongly advocated the re-establishing a Platonic state in the revitalization of a pagan Hellenic civilization. Scholarios' is aware of Plethon's duplicity in his aspirations and knows what stating that Plato's philosophy adheres to Christian doctrine really entails. For Plethon, in advocating the argument that the Latin Church's Trinitarian doctrine has more in common with paganism than Orthodoxy, affirms the political motivation behind this statement, which was to conciliate the Latins, with whom the Byzantines were in the process of trying to find mutual grounds of ecclesiastical union against the Ottoman Turks.

doctrines, and again after his return from Florence, to advocate anew what he had proposed in 1415 and 1418 concerning a Hellene state. “Plethon's defence of orthodoxy was, in fact, a defence of his heterodoxy, to rephrase De Bolt”.⁶⁶² Scholarios’ political views would be in direct contraposition to Plethon's, and consequently would be the basis for the antagonistic relationship between Plethon and Scholarios.

Scholarios’ political and pragmatic insight meant that he was aware that the State and Church needed to address the political and social changes of his times and try to create a stable, strong nation under the norms of imperial and Orthodox Christian *oikonomia*.⁶⁶³ This same political “pragmatism was the political motivation, before and after his Patriarchate” that is before and after the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks “and the basis for a realistic assessment of his people’s situation”.⁶⁶⁴

To quote Livanos in his final analysis of the relationship between Plethon and Scholarios: “Brilliant and visionary through Plethon may have been, it is difficult to imagine a world in which his ideas could have been implemented. None of Scholarios’ ideas was as glamorous as those of Plethon, who has been credited with pioneering everything from Constitutional Monarchy to modern economic policy, but none of Plethon’s ideas could have been put into effect among the fifteenth-century Greeks. The reforms Plethon envisioned would have constituted the greatest social revolution in history, and it was clear to pragmatic thinkers like Scholarios that the Byzantines’ political situation allowed them to do little but prepare for and adjust to foreign domination. Had Plethon somehow managed to convert so intensely Christian a people

⁶⁶² De Bolt, ‘George Gemistos Plethon on God: Heterodoxy in Defence of Orthodoxy’, See: Introductional page.

⁶⁶³ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 75.

⁶⁶⁴ Gerhard Podskalsky, *Theology and Philosophy in Byzantium*, 86 87. See: Podskalsky introduction alluding to the political situation in the Byzantine Empire; Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 78.

as the Byzantines to his own version of ancient Platonism, they would have enjoyed none of the privileges under Ottoman rule to which the Christian subjects were entitled”.⁶⁶⁵

I have argued that the relationship between Plethon and Scholarios was wholly based on their individual political perceptions that governed their respective attitudes towards one another, and not on philosophical or theological judgement, even though each engendered their own convictions governed on the use of these subjects to furnish their respective political perspectives. In the next chapter, I will examine the motive for such political motivations and the relationship between East and West, in terms of cause and effects, and reflect on Scholarios’ part in this development.

⁶⁶⁵ Livanos, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence*, 78.

CHAPTER SIX –SCHOLARIOS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

In this chapter I will endeavour to clarify the reason for Scholarios' change of view from pro-Union to anti-Union by introducing the political and economic context which resulted in the antagonisms in the relationship between East and West. I will argue that it is important to understand these contexts, in order to comprehend the motivations of the Council convened in Florence and of Scholarios' position on these complex issues.

6.1 Economic and Military Dependency

The relationship of the Latins with the Byzantines was played out in political manoeuvrings over centuries, but the century leading up to 1453 was particularly significant in determining the fate of the Eastern Roman Empire, or as it is commonly known in the West, the Byzantine Empire. In what follows, I discuss the increasing commercial, cultural and political influence of the Latin powers over the East. This influence was to be the catalyst for the subsequent political domination by the Latins over a major part of the Empire and the total reliance of the Byzantines on the Latins for military assistance.

By the fourteenth century, military assistance was desperately needed by the Byzantines to thwart the expansionism of the Ottoman Turks. To obtain it, a dialogue was required between the Byzantines and with the Roman Church and the Latin West. Because of the processes involved in the dialogue and in obtaining that aid, studies in philosophy and theology were needed to prepare for negotiation. The careful selection of individuals

with accredited philosophical and theological aptitude was required to meet the necessity of debating with the Latins on the topic of theology.

The dialogue was keenly awaited on the part of the Latins, not so much by the secular authorities, but most notably by the Roman Church. The reason that the Roman Church desired this dialogue on Church unity was to further their intent to liberate the Holy Land and to convert the Mohammedans to Christianity.⁶⁶⁶ The application of this policy was instrumental in the political and religious manoeuvrings that the Latins and Roman Church were coordinating towards this endeavour. The prosecution of this objective can be seen in the energetic proselytizing perpetrated predominantly by the Latin religious foundations in Constantinople and in mainland Greece and Cyprus.⁶⁶⁷

Latin secular powers were not indifferent to these objectives, but were assisted by the ecclesiastical discussions in achieving their own political aspirations, whether they were commercial or military. An examination of the method used in achieving the political ends is essential to the understanding of the complexities of the relationship between Latins and Byzantines, especially in the last throes of the Byzantine Empire in the fifteenth century. One basic component in the relationship between the Byzantines and the West was their dependency on fiscal aid from the West, which would lead to the desire for further military aid required by the Byzantines.⁶⁶⁸

⁶⁶⁶ Page, *Being Byzantine*, 53; Raymond Loenertz, 'The Byzantine Theodore and Andrew Chrysoberges Dominicans and the negotiations for the union of the Greek and Latin of churches, 1415-1430', [Les Dominicains Byzantins Theodore Et Andre Chrysoberges Et Les Négociations Pour L'union Des Églises Grecque Et Latine De 1415-1430], *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 24, 1954, 2; Sylvia Schein, *Fideles Crucis: The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1274-1314*. (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 200, 214.

⁶⁶⁷ Miltiades B. Efthimiou, *Greeks and Latins on Cyprus in the Thirteenth Century*. (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1987), 79; Nikou T. Zaharopoulou, *Church in Greece under the Francokratia*. Thessaloniki: pournara, 1981), 97, 109.

⁶⁶⁸ Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400*. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979) 253.

In the thirteenth century, when the Byzantines were experiencing the loss of the eastern provinces of the Empire to the encroaching Ottoman Turks, the fiscal revenues derived from these provinces were no longer forthcoming. Unfortunately, this loss was to be repeated in the western provinces, which were either dominated or beleaguered by Serbian and Latin forces and Ottoman Turks, leaving a very small portion for the Byzantines from which to obtain any significant fiscal power.⁶⁶⁹ The Byzantines, however, had not only to contend with the military dominance in its former provinces by other forces, but also the constant belligerence of the two major Latin powers, Genoa and Venice, who were constantly at war with each other over commercial and trade dominance.⁶⁷⁰

When, over time, Genoese merchants in Constantinople became more successful and overbearing than the Venetians, this only served to galvanize reprisals. This competition destabilized the Byzantines not only militarily but fiscally as well.⁶⁷¹ It is noteworthy that the annual import duties from the colony of the Genoese (Galata) greatly exceeded those of the City of Constantinople.⁶⁷² The ensuing danger for the Empire was foreseeable. This clearly reminds us of the constant rivalry between the two major

⁶⁶⁹ Angeliki E. Laiou and Cécile Morrisson, *The Byzantine Economy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 166, 234-235. The observation here about the role of the economic factor is crucial and relevant to the relationship between the two communities of Latin and Byzantine, especially when it leads to the dominance of power by the Ottoman Turks.

⁶⁷⁰ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol.II. 376–377,378.The fear of Latin influence and dominance was not extracted from the memory of the ‘Byzantine’ and Imperial Bureaucracy when state imperial policies favoured the Latins over the Byzantines, which was to result in acrimonious upheaval. An example is Mary of Antioch, the wife of Manuel I Comneni.She propagated Latinophile policies and the interests of the Roman Church within the Imperial family in the twelfth century, and cannot be extricated from this period of fourteenth and fifteenth century’s political and fiscal problems, for these policies were to be repeated and to have direct and consequential repercussions up to the Empire’s last days.

⁶⁷¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 341.

⁶⁷² Geanakoplos, *Byzantium*,289.(Citing Necephorus Gregoras, *Byzantina historia*, ed. L.Schopen and I.Bekker [Bonn.1839-45],vol.2,841-842)The Greek historian Nikephoros Gregoras estimates that in the mid-fourteenth century the Imperial Authority in Constantinople received annually far less in import duties than the Genoese colony of Galata, situated just across the Golden Horn from Constantinople. The customs duties that accrued for Genoese at Galata amounted to two hundred thousand gold coins each year, whereas the Imperial City was receiving only thirty thousand.

contenders, Genoa and Venice, which were exploiting every opportunity to enhance their own economic supremacy. The impact of this had drastic implications for imperial finance and military dominance.⁶⁷³

As Nicol poignantly describes, Isaac II Angelos was the first of a dynasty which sapped the roots of the Empire “through his miscalculated policies until, like a dying tree, it fell before the wind of the Fourth Crusade”. Nicol’s account shows how the prosecution of Byzantine political policies resulted in the processes of the commercial and military dominance by the Latin powers.⁶⁷⁴ One facet of this dominance culminated in the political expediency of an intermarriage between Latins and Byzantines.⁶⁷⁵

The observation that behind the military operation were the two-fold economic and political motives is significant in terms of strategic objectives, since the Latins utilized every opportunity to enhance their economic status.⁶⁷⁶ This military and economic dependence is repeated in the fourteenth century. Emperor Andronicus II invited the Catalan Company, a mercenary band, to solve a political problem, but this only

⁶⁷³ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 282. Also see note 93. In reference to the above footnote, Gregoras and Joseph Bryennios remark on the situation of foreign marriages. In a somewhat acrimonious remark, Gregoras comments: “Their vanity made them marry foreign princesses and marry off their daughters to foreign rulers. The subjects of the Palaiologoi emulated their incompetent emperors, ceased to practice military exercises and lost completely their warrior spirit.” Again, the admonitions of Bryennios not to trust the Latins in any political settlement only reflected the mistrust and disdain the Byzantines were experiencing in relation to the Latins, due to their dominance of political power in the Empire. The remarks Bryennios expresses about any ecclesiastical union and political aid were defining and reflective, particular after the outcome of Council of Florence and the consequences of the failed crusade of Varna.

⁶⁷⁴ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 110, 264–295.

⁶⁷⁵ Geanakoplos, *Byzantium*, 288–300; Romanides, 1–30. In the eleventh century, dramatic changes to the marriage policy of the Empire occurred, when the Komnenoi dynasty started to use marriage as leverage to create political stability. Four of the five dynasties of Komnenoi in the twelfth century took Western Christian or Latin wives. For instance, Isaac married Catherine of Vladislav, John II married Irene Piriska of Hungary and Manuel I married Latins in both of his marriages, first Birtha of Sulzbach and then Mary of Antioch. These are but a few of the many who married into the Imperial Family of the Romioi; all were examples of the political expediency that the Empire was experiencing in that period.

⁶⁷⁶ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 212–227, 264–282.

escalated foreign dominion.⁶⁷⁷ The continuous reliance on foreign troops was to have repercussions in the final days of the reign of Andronikos III. The Genoese took advantage of the absence of the Eastern Roman Empire's fleet from the City; they sent their ships to all the ports of the Archipelago to seize the whole import trade in the Black Sea and in the Straits.⁶⁷⁸

The aftermath of these actions, let alone the audacity of even conceiving of these acts in the first place, speak volumes about the economic factors that moved the foreign powers towards these actions and further subjugated Byzantium under foreign political interest.⁶⁷⁹ The same policy of relying on foreign power is repeated in the middle of the same century, under Emperor John Kantakouzinus. The Emperor's invitation to Turkish troops to quell civil war and aid him in his struggle, only led him to see the expansion of Turkish power that entrenched the Turks in the European flank of the Empire, unable to extricate themselves, which ultimately led to the demise of the Empire itself. The lack of territorial dominance amounted to the limitation of economic funds. Even though the Empire did manage to raise the necessary finance to allow the building of vessels for commerce and military use in order to be able to counter-attack in the face of this growing menace, the loss of strategic territory, or perhaps the inability to reclaim it and retain it through foreign dominance, destined the Empire to be at the mercy of foreign interests.⁶⁸⁰

These examples reflect the instability of the Byzantine Empire, for as long as it employed foreign troops and depended upon them to solve internal and external

⁶⁷⁷ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 122.

⁶⁷⁸ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol.II. 616, 625–6.

⁶⁷⁹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 227.

⁶⁸⁰ Ibid. 209. In further explanation on this situation of foreign power, it re-introduced the political dominance of foreign mercenaries, which was devastating for the Empire.

political problems; then the Empire would be destined for extinction. This reliance also demonstrated to external forces the vulnerability and military weakness within the Empire. It literally invited foreign powers to manipulate and dominate the Empire's domestic and international interest for their own gain.⁶⁸¹

The retaking of Constantinople by the Byzantines from the Latins in 1261, under Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos, did not enhance the Empire, but depleted most of her Eastern domain. Subsequently this was to be repeated under Michael VIII's successors, where those western provinces that still were under the authority of the imperial Byzantine authorities were constantly harassed into fiscal domination by Latins or Serbs or Ottoman Turks.

The existence of Venetian and Genoese enclaves in Constantinople and Galata-Pera is a prime example of the spread of influence by the Latin/Western powers, where within the perimeters of the Imperial City, the establishment of a tower and fortifications had, in fact, created a state within a state. This was not the only perimeter of Western domain, as the northern area of the Byzantium peninsula was inhabited by Venetians and other Westerners: consequently, the Empire's attempt to curtail the growing foreign influence failed.⁶⁸²

⁶⁸¹ Scholarios, 'Letter to Demetrius Paleologue against the Union of Florence (1450)', [Lettre à Démétrius Paléologue contre l'union de Florence (1450)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 7, 127. Joseph Bryennios vehemently opposed any doctrinal compromises and political agreements in order to acquire military aid from the Latins. Bryennios stated, "Let no one be deceived by delusive hopes that the Italian allied troops will sooner or later come to us. But if they do pretend to rise to defend us, they will take arms in order to destroy our city, race and name." The reliance on foreign troops and Latin political and commercial dominance indicated that the Empire's commercial interests were manipulated by foreign powers.

⁶⁸² Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 585–586.

6.2 Scholarios' Relationship with Latin Ecclesiastical Institutions

The Latin religious establishment was certainly represented in Constantinople, and one particular example we can cite is Dimitrios Kydonis and his relationship with the Dominican monastery in Galata/Pera in Constantinople. This Latin religious establishment was a direct influence in the procedure of interaction and the process of proselytism, which was established by the conversion of Kydonis and his pupils, the Chrysobergis brothers.⁶⁸³

The newly established mendicant Orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, were at the front lines of the effort to convert the Mohammedans in the East and to bring the Greeks into the fold of the Roman Church. The Latin treatise '*Refutation of Islam*', by the Florentine Dominican friar Ricaldus de Monte Croce, mentions several notable Dominican friars who were very active in this endeavour. The services of Thomas Aquinas, his treatise on the '*Contra errores graecorum*' (*Against the Errors of the Greeks*) as well as '*Summa contra gentiles*' as has been stated, and the Franciscan, Bonaventura, all contributed to the effort to win over the Greeks at the Council of Lyons in 1274.⁶⁸⁴

The employment of Dominicans as emissaries of Western powers to Constantinople and the Pope as precursors to the Council of Lyons and subsequently to the Council of

⁶⁸³ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 78-80; Loenertz, *The Dominicans*, 5; Loenertz, 'The Dominicans Establishments', 209; G.Brotto and Caspare Zonta, *Acta Graduum Academicorum Gymnasii Patavini*. (Padova: Padova Antenore, 1969) 27-28,35. Reference to Manuscript of University of Uppsala: *Contra errores orientalem et Graecorum* written in Constantinople. It states the influence of the Dominicans in Constantinople against the Orthodox East and at the Council of Constance (1414-1418)-where the document was again used against the Greeks who were to attend for the purpose of union of the Churches.

⁶⁸⁴ Kydonis, 'According to the Blasphemous Dogma of Gregory Palamas', P.G.154, The section on the Procession of the Holy Spirit is from 865A-968B; Robin Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2009), 94-122; Geoffrey Villehardouin, *The Siege of Constantinople*. In Kosta Antipa translation. George Sarafianou Introduction, 2nd edition. (Athens: Hatzinikoli, 1985), 13.

Florence, attests to the extent of the power and influence of these mendicant Orders.⁶⁸⁵

This was especially true for the communication and relationships between East and West that involved Scholarios. Upon their conversion to the Dominican Order, Dimitrios Kydonis and the Chrysobergis brothers, Maximos, Theodore and Andrew, played active roles in implementing the agenda for propagating Roman dogma, as they were commissioned by the papacy and the Dominican Order to work towards the conversion of the Greeks.⁶⁸⁶ Andrew particularly is a principle contributor in the deliberations of the Council of Florence in endeavouring to coerce the Greeks.⁶⁸⁷

If the main conduits of influence towards Scholarios' Latin studies were from within the imperial bureaucracy, as the third chapter of this thesis suggests, then the reason for these studies was to address the avenues of influence directed from the Latin religious establishments,⁶⁸⁸ since the initial reasons for these studies were proliferated by the Latin monastic communities. Nevertheless, the East was in need of assistance from the Latin/West to combat the growing menace of the Ottoman Turks, while having to deal with the equally troublesome Latin presence and their political manoeuvrings.⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁵ Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 19; Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews*, 94–122; Loenertz, *Les Dominicains*, 5.

⁶⁸⁶ Loenertz, 'The Dominicans', 5; I.M.Hatzifoti, *Byzantium and Ecclesia*. (Athens: Apostolic Diakonias, 1978), 10, 52–53. See: the comments made by Professor N. B. Tomadakis in reference to philosophical influences in the introduction section of this booklet.

⁶⁸⁷ Kydonis, 'According to the Blasphemous Dogma of Gregory Palamas', P.G.154, 693; Ramon Lull, 'General Pontifical Epistle for the Recovery of the Holy Lands', [*Epistola summo pontifici pro recuperatione Terrae Sanctae*], in *Beati Magistri R. Lulli opera Latina*, iii, ed. J. Rambaud-Buhot (Palma de Mallorca: s.n, 1954), 270–82. The retaking of the Holy Land could not be accomplished if East and West were divided. The Roman Church believed that the return of the East was necessary for the salvation of the East and also, ultimately, for the return of the Holy Land. The Greeks accepted the primacy of the Pope and the Filioque Clause, and "the necessity of incorporating the Eastern Roman Empire into the Roman Church as contributing to the conversion of the non-Christians of the East—the Mohammedans."

⁶⁸⁸ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 203. See the presences of the Franciscans in Galata; Fisher, 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and Translation', 96.

⁶⁸⁹ Constance Head, 'Manual Palaiologos the Traveling Emperor, in *Mankind: the Magazine of Popular History* 4. 3 (1973 Oct): 20–22. Head illustrates the vulnerability of the Empire by emphasizing its imperative need of political assistance. Her summation of the critical situations that ultimately led to the Empire's demise shows the causes underlying the movement towards the demise being the ambition of

Thus, theological topics had to be accommodated to facilitate the political interests of both East and West.⁶⁹⁰ Proselytising the doctrines of the Roman Church was the main goal, not only of the Roman Church, but it was also a goal of the Western civil powers in their relationships with the court of Constantinople. The principal goal was to unite the churches before any discussions of political assistance could even be proposed.

In '*Les Établissements Dominicains de Péra-Constantinople*', Loenertz states that the centre of administration for the Dominicans in the Orient was in Constantinople, to be precise, in the enclave of the Genoese of Galata-Pera.⁶⁹¹ Joseph Gill elucidates that, "The religious Orders, particularly the Dominicans and the Friars Minor (Franciscans), had monasteries in the environs of Constantinople and were in constant touch with the Greek ecclesiastical world, which was not a little edified by their missionary zeal."⁶⁹² This statement provides two clear descriptions of the strength of the influence of the religious Orders, and explains the reason for it by referring to the suspicion and apprehension of the Orthodox with respect to the Latin religious institutions.

the heir apparent to the throne, the manipulation of foreign powers—Turks and Latins—and the inability of the Emperors to change its status. Kydonis and Scholarios were aware of the political instability, which is the reason for their shared admiration of the West and of Thomistic philosophical and theological speculations.

⁶⁹⁰ John Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982), 101; John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* First US edition New York: Fordham University Press, 1974a, 106–107; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 173; Southern R.W., *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. (England: Harmondsworth: Penguin Books), 292–298; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 106–107. It has been asserted above that the proselytising of the doctrines of the Roman Church was the main goal not only of the Roman Church, but also of the Western civil powers, other than their commercial interests, which was their prime agenda, in their relationships with the court of Constantinople. The principal goal was to unite the churches before any discussions of political assistance could even be broached.

⁶⁹¹ Loenertz, 'The Dominicans', 8; Raymond J Loenertz, 'Fr Philippe de Bindo Incotri O.P. of the Convent Pera, Inquisitor in the Orient', [Fr. Philippe de Bindo Incotri O.P. du Convent de Pera, Inquisiteur en Orient], *Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum*, (Rome: Instituto Storico Domenicano 1931) 265; Loenertz, 'The Dominicans Établissements', 209. An account of this was given in Chapter One, relating to the ever-present Western influence up to this present day, and especially the influence of the Latin religious institutions.

⁶⁹² Gill, *Council of Florence*, 19. Gill emphatically states the enormous influence of the Latin monastic Orders, as do Loenertz and Mercati. The influence of Latinization came from external sources rather than being generated from within the Imperial City, despite much information being of the opposite view, suggestg a restrictive viewpoint. The correlation between the Latinization of Scholarios and the Latin monastic foundations in Constantinople is not directly assumed, nor is the association between Scholarios and Kydonis, although Scholarios did seek to emulate him.

The phrase “constantly in touch with the Greek ecclesiastical world” has sundry implications: political aspiration for economic and military assistance, the conveying of these policies through ecclesiastical emissaries, the conditions required in the application of these policies and, most important of all, the factor of conversion, required to acquire these desired outcomes. It is evident also in the examples of prominent individuals, as Kydonis’ conversion to the Roman Church and his translations of the works of Thomas Aquinas also indicate this influence.⁶⁹³ In addition to Kydonis and Chrysobergis, Bessarion, the Metropolitan of Nicaea and Isidore Metropolitan of Kiev also fostered a strong conviction, after their conversion, to proselytize to as many of the Byzantines as possible about the theological doctrines of the Roman Church, and they were instrumental in the acceptance of the Filioque Clause at the Council. The individuals named are but a sample of those who were motivated by political and theological dictates.⁶⁹⁴

6.3 Procuring Positions: Papal and Latin connections

Scholarios’ Letter 15 to the Pope, Eugenius IV, in which he sought service with the Roman Curia, is evocative of the close association with a Dominican Latin cleric Louis of Tabriz [*Tarbyzios Lodizions*], in Scholarios’ Greek version of his work as (*Λοδίζιος ὁ δὲ Ταρβύζιος*), residing in Constantinople.⁶⁹⁵ The letter was to be conveyed to the Pope through this emissary.⁶⁹⁶ What is clear is that Scholarios was very much in

⁶⁹³ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 118; Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), 100.

⁶⁹⁴ Gill, *Council of Florence*, 254–267.

⁶⁹⁵ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV’, vol.IV.433 v22. Apparently in the work of Scholarios is using the ‘of the’ as denoted in French ‘De’ in Greek, which appears in his work as ‘ὁ δὲ’.

⁶⁹⁶ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV’, vol.IV.,432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291, 302. The second factor, which relates to the above observation about his correspondence

communication, and on friendly terms, with a Latin cleric in Constantinople; hence it seems to confirm a certain Latin influence from this source. The implication might be of particular relevance to Scholarios' interest in the theological speculations of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, if, in addition to the imperial bureaucracy this avenue of influence was also the foremost conduit of influence of Latin learning.⁶⁹⁷

Letter 15 is dated from the beginning of 1434, whereas Letter 5 is dated at the end of 1435. Letter 5 is addressed to the student, John and indicates that the Papal delegate, Christopher Garatoni endorses Scholarios' hopes in acquiring service with the Pope. The letter continues to suggest Scholarios will even go to Italy the following spring, stating he has spent a final winter at Constantinople.⁶⁹⁸

The correlation of correspondence from Scholarios to the Pope desiring papal service through the intermediary, Louis Tabriz, and the gratification that Garatoni aspires to in his hopes of attaining papal service strongly suggests more than a casual connection. Certainly any sense of theological differences is lacking, especially the theological discrepancy that he would so vehemently address later. What is obvious in the above interchange is that the Latins were very receptive of Scholarios, more so than previously thought, and his favouring of the policies of Byzantines or Latins were governed according to the directives that mandated these self-interests.

with the Pope, is that Scholarios seeking service with Roman Curia, without hesitating to query the problem of the theological diversity between the churches. This indication would suggest that Scholarios was motivated primarily by his political aspiration rather than the niceties of theological positions.

⁶⁹⁷ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424. Turner writes that Mark Eugenikos was a close friend and the first teacher of Scholarios. He further claims that Scholarios had studied, not only under Eugenikos, but also with John Comnenos, John Chortasmenos, Joseph Bryennios and Makarios of Athos. However, he claims that these teachers could not have taken Scholarios beyond initial philosophical studies. But see Angelov, 29–115: The recent publication of Dimiter Angelov's book *Imperial ideology and political thought in Byzantium* would indicate that these particular studies were undertaken within the political context of the imperial court, which would indicate that the individuals mentioned above were certainly his instructors in the Imperial bureaucracy.

⁶⁹⁸ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-The same', vol.IV. 413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 292.

An examination of Letter 15 leads us to understand that Scholarios proceeds gradually: first supporting the Pope in papal political/theological directives, and then addressing the Pope with adulation, to ask to be engaged in the service of the Roman Curia.⁶⁹⁹ This obviously indicates that Scholarios is seeking a place in the entourage of the Pope on his own initiative and, without any hesitation, lost sight of his political aspirations.⁷⁰⁰

In examining his correspondence, the manoeuvring by Scholarios to acquire a political position with Latins in the East or in the West is unmistakable, as is his desire to obtain a higher position in the Imperial service.⁷⁰¹ It also suggests that his slow ascendancy to a higher position with the imperial bureaucracy might be due to Scholarios' searching other avenues of service, as his letters pertaining to this topic suggest.

The economic condition of the Capital, especially in 1435–7, was precarious. Its reduced bureaucratic positions, once dominant within the imperial secular bureaucracy, were now operating as an ecclesiastical positions, as was stated in Chapter Three of this thesis.⁷⁰² Scholarios, therefore, is seeking to find a better situation and is considering

⁶⁹⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV.433; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 302–3.

⁷⁰⁰ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 302–304.

⁷⁰¹ Scholarios 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV.432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 295.

⁷⁰² Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 47. On the question of secular/ecclesiastical position, Blanchet re-states the conditions in which Scholarios found himself. "At the beginning of the 15th century however, the Chancellery of the Palace does not widely open its doors to newcomers, due to its economic difficulties and due to a probably declining activity, in an Empire almost reduced in power and prestige". Reflecting on Angelov's claim here, it would seem there is some accuracy but it is slightly distorted. In fact, applied rhetorical training in the submission of intended evidence to the Imperial administration, was required of the Byzantines who wished to maintain a position, and was synonymous with the requirements of anyone who desired service with the imperial or ecclesiastical bureaucracy. Scholarios's position in the Imperial bureaucracy then cannot be only, as Blanchet states, as a secular position with the imperial bureaucracy, but this position had become an ecclesiastical function by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, even though Scholarios was a layman it was mostly prevalent as an ecclesiastical position.

several options, including those that would mean leaving Constantinople to better his fiscal problem.⁷⁰³

Certainly this is apparent in Scholarios' letters to the Pope in 1434, not only beseeching him to be taken on in service with the Papal Curia, but honouring the person of the Pope in aspiring to the "kissing of his right foot", which is a gesture of submission and acquiescence. The enormity of this latter statement requires that we analyse whether Scholarios was fully aware of the implications of the term "kissing", or whether he merely states it as a mark of respect. We would need to inquire whether Scholarios really was genuine in his actions here, as that would define his approach to theology, considering his written gesture of submission and acquiescence of his letter to the Pope suggest a political aspiration rather than a staunch Orthodox stance, motivated by the importance of fiscal compensation on the part of Scholarios.

Nevertheless, it does demonstrate Scholarios' aspiration to pursue political objectives.

Both Letter 15 and Letter 5, affirm his willingness to be in the Papal or Latin service.⁷⁰⁴

⁷⁰³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same and To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV. 413, 433. In these letters reflects what has been suggested; the economic status of Constantinople was not the prestigious City of its previous years, having lost most of her wealth, and was found to be in state of dereliction with many palaces and churches in need of repairs. This would suggest tight restraint of financial revenue was required to be able to subsist, plus the occurrence of the epidemic of the plague depleted any hope of stability within the City. The need to leave Constantinople for a better life only emphasizes this situation. However, Scholarios seeking a better position elsewhere is not limited only to this economic factor but also suggests Scholarios political aspirations, as suggested his Letters 4, 5 and 15; Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos*, 7-20. See the political instability prior to the period of the Siege of Constantinople; Nicol, *The Last Centuries*, 346-368; Stephen W. Reinert, 'Fragmentation', in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. Cyril Mango. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 254.

⁷⁰⁴ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 304. The tone of Scholarios's letter to the Pope leaves no doubt about his enthusiastic desire to be engaged in service by Eugene IV. Scholarios is not only showing obsequiousness when addressing the Pontiff, who is described as "successor of Peter", which is recognized, more generally, as the Apostolic legitimacy, but it seems even an obligate approach in his personal address to Eugene IV. The nature of the address, calling the Roman Pontiff "father and common pastor of the oecoumène" is rather unusual on the part of a Byzantine. In attributing these appellations to the person of the Pope, Scholarios acknowledges a primacy of honour to the Patriarch of Rome, even though as Blanchet states, they denied him any form of authority in universal character. These appellations were always recognized by the Orthodox Church and never denied for the person of the Pope, but what is unusual is that in the use of these well-chosen phrases, Scholarios appears to be in allegiance with the Roman pontiff.

However, even if the letter has been altered, as Blanchet asserts, Scholarios was not reticent in his choice of words as he does not hesitate to use terminologies such as the "flaming desire of your blessedness." The terminology confirms that political and economic status was of prime importance to Scholarios and it was not a matter of theological criteria, where the dogmatic issues are of seemingly little concern.⁷⁰⁵

Furthermore the extract from Letter 11, *To the Emperor John* (*A l'empereur Jean*, i.e. *Emperor John VIII Palaiologos*), illustrates the uncertainty of the 1430s. Scholarios relates to Emperor John VIII his dismay at the thought of living elsewhere, or of watching ships and sentimentalizing their destination. He asks whether it would not be better to age in these distant places. However, notwithstanding these fanciful thoughts, it suggests a limitation to a person's desire, which is again, is reflected in the statement "sometimes to rent the happiness of a monastic life". He goes on to say; "we that are installed anywhere, it is necessary that we look around and that our decision remains in abeyance, since any kind of life is sealed to us". This does not evoke the desire for monastic life, but is more likely to be a reflection on the political situation that came to pass in the year 1430, in addition to the economic difficulties of living in Constantinople with its somewhat dilapidated conditions.⁷⁰⁶ The literal translation of the letter eliminates the allegorical significance of the words used, particularly the diminished Byzantine domain and the effect of the dominance of the Ottoman Turks.⁷⁰⁷

There are three distinct illustrations, other than those mentioned above, that accentuates the relationship of Scholarios with the Latins and suggests his motives were political and not really concerned with any theological or philosophical aspirations. One is

⁷⁰⁵ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 304.

⁷⁰⁶ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. Two, 686.

⁷⁰⁷ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 296.

Scholarios' interest in seeking employment in Mistra, the second is in Rome and the third is in Lesbos.⁷⁰⁸ From the beginning of the 1430s, any political and economic status was fragile in the City of Constantinople, particularly in the light of the imminent danger that was to befall the City, as exemplified in Thessaloniki.⁷⁰⁹ Nor could they forget the siege and storming of Constantinople by the Turks as recently as 1422. The defrauding of fiscal funds that were destined for the imperial coffers, which was perpetrated by all Byzantines, Latins and Turks residing within the City, is an example that reflects the downgrading of the political and economic strength of Constantinople.⁷¹⁰ Any person who could find employment elsewhere was considered fortunate.

The conditions in Constantinople justify the reason for Scholarios' intention to leave, like his friend Bessarion, for the Peloponnese.⁷¹¹ It is a logical location for him to aspire to go. His desire was to find employment in Morea (Peloponnese), which had at that time a good a stable relationship with the Ottoman Turks that guaranteed a steady economic income. What is obvious is that Scholarios is not interested in theology, nor in entering any monastery. The subject is not entertained, but instead as his Letters 6, 7 and 8 shows, Bessarion and Despot Theodore are his main avenues to find employment in Morea and elsewhere. The constant correspondence between these individuals depicts

⁷⁰⁸ Scholarios, 'Scholarios' Letters- The same to the Same-The same', vol.IV.412–413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 300–306.

⁷⁰⁹ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 363-364,373; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*,347-349.Thessaloniki capitulation to the Ottoman Turks in March 1430

⁷¹⁰ Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 201–203.

⁷¹¹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-The priest Bessarion beginning of 1436', [Au prêtre Bessarion début de 1436], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930),419 ; Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Billett address to ecclesiastical opponents of the union (15 November 1452, [Billett adresse aux ecclésiastiques adversaires de l'union (15 novembre 1452)]', in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.III.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 166.

his frustration with the situation in Constantinople⁷¹² and his dissatisfaction with the Emperor is directed by Scholarios to the Despot of Morea, Theodore.⁷¹³

If these letters are considered genuine and are products of Scholarios' hand, then examination of these letters emphasizes activities that were not attributed to Scholarios previously. Note that the actual date of Letter 15 is 1434 so it was not written after the Council of 1440 as it was previously affirmed. It designates Scholarios' interest in leaving Constantinople, negotiating the acquisition of a position elsewhere. Scholarios refers to his possible departure for Italy, specifically to Rome, as apart from his ambitious political behaviour, he was on affable terms with the Latins.

The letters of Scholarios has drawn our attention to facts that most historians so far have omitted. This has enormous implications for the study of Scholarios' work and his relationship with the Latins that have normally been missed. It also suggests, prior to the above Letters 6, 7 and 8 to Bessarion and Despot Theodore that are dated 1434–6, Scholarios' continuous desire to acquire a position, to better his financial situation rather than remain in Constantinople, and that he had a more than usual affiliation with the Latins and the West.

⁷¹² Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To his Students', vol.IV. 408-410; Scholarios, 'Scholarios' Letters-To Despot Theodore', [Au despote Théodore (1436)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 417–419; Turner, 'The Career of George –Gennadius Scholarius', 428; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 299.

⁷¹³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Despot Theodore', vol.IV.418–419; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 301. The correspondence between Scholarios and the Despot had begun some time before the drafting of Letter 6, since Scholarios begins by thanking Theodore for the letter which he received.

Conciliarists Presence

It is further argues that Scholarios' papal support is reflected in his opposition to the Conciliarists of Basel, since the Emperor and imperial authorities were in direct communication with them.⁷¹⁴ It suggests a marked discrepancy in the proceedings; as anyone who was in service with the imperial bureaucracy could not expound any personal opinion. So by declaring himself against the Conciliarists from Basel, is Scholarios announcing that is he an ally of Eugene IV and therefore against the imperial authority? This would be contradictory to the imperial policy, especially prior to any decision by the Emperor in this matter.

Is Scholarios propounding an official decision that the imperial authorities had decided upon concerning the Pope, rather than the Conciliarists? If so, then Scholarios was upholding the Emperor's policy on this diplomatic issue. If not, then Scholarios was in breach of protocol of his service with the imperial bureaucracy and may be seen to be becoming involved in this single diplomatic issue for his own personal aggrandisement.

It is possible that in this respect Scholarios may be seen, in the commitment that he expressed in this letter, as a real active propagandist for the Union and the recognition of the Roman Church, which would imply his agreement on the doctrine of the Filioque Clause. There are two points of view on the argument about whether Scholarios saw the theological discrepancy as really nothing out of the ordinary. Scholarios is certainly not up to pleading for the conversion to Roman Christianity, but from a personal point of view, it seems he has considerable agreement with the Latins, in this period where the dogmatic issues are of seemingly little concern. Alternatively, Scholarios' stance on

⁷¹⁴ Deno J. Geanakoplos, 'An Orthodox View of the Councils of Basel (1431-1449) and of Florence (1438-1439)', as Paradigm for the Study of Modern Ecumenical Councils, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 30,3 (1985): 314-315.

dogmatic issues might be subordinate to his political aspirations for either his Emperor or for Papal Rome, and is implied in this alliance.

Letter 7, probably dated 1436, evokes the deterioration of the conditions in Constantinople and, as stated by Vasiliev⁷¹⁵ is written a few months after Letter 5, probably at the beginning of 1436.⁷¹⁶ The decisive evidence of Scholarios' aspirations is reflected in the words: "that you do not ignore me in so good provisions." Scholarios is not overlooking any avenue in the negotiations to obtain a position with more advantages than those he is experiencing in Constantinople. Scholarios' negotiations to attempt to acquire a position superior to the one he has in Constantinople suggest that he was not primarily motivated by theological concerns, but rather that in his on-going relationship with the Latins, ecclesiastical or secular; he was focussed on personal political and economic advancement.⁷¹⁷

If information above is correct, it implies some serious determination on the part of Scholarios in his drive to obtain a superior position.⁷¹⁸ It also suggests that even though he was requesting diplomatic positions with foreign administrations, he was determined to find a position within the imperial bureaucracy, even by threatening to leave. He places the weight of the decision on members of the Imperial family and Authority, in an attempt to get them to acquiesce to his desires for preferment within the imperial bureaucracy.⁷¹⁹

⁷¹⁵ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. Two, 676; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same', vol.IV. 418.

⁷¹⁶ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same', vol.IV.413-419.

⁷¹⁷ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 306.

⁷¹⁸ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same', vol. IV. 413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 306.

⁷¹⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same and To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV.413, 417-418,432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 307.

6.4 Political Past Events and Scholarios' Correspondence

The Council was arranged to convene in 1438–9: it was arranged for one specific reason, and that was to achieve Union of the churches, with the further aspiration of obtaining military aid and assistance for the City of Constantinople. Scholarios' early days in service with the imperial bureaucracy suggest a coordinated strategy towards this one aim, which was the political desire of the imperial authority. In the examination of discussion of the period prior to the Council, quotes from various letters indicate Scholarios' enthusiasm for the Council, and suggest he saw it a necessary in order to gain assistance for the City of Constantinople.⁷²⁰ Thus we can see that events fully ten to twelve years prior to the Council are preparing the ground for the eventual event itself.

First, the letters written in the period prior to the Council of Florence in 1438–9, emphasize the urgent need to convene the Council, but also indicate Scholarios was eager for the Council to convene, as was the imperial authority that desired it.⁷²¹ Recent events between Latins, Byzantine and Ottoman Turks meant that each was manipulating their political position and attempting to secure dominance for their own interests. The intricate political power play that was exerted by all in this period is complex, but in order to understand the progress of Scholarios to anti-Union stance, we need to examine the events more closely.

The attempted conquest of Constantinople in 1422 by Sultan Murad II was only averted due to the political manoeuvring of Emperor Manuel II. However, in 1423 and in 1430

⁷²⁰ Scholarios, 'Speech at Florence on the Religious Question', [Discours à Florence sur la question religieuse], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 296, 325–372; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 428; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 344–352.

⁷²¹ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

Murad's punitive expedition to southern Greece, destroying the Hexamilion wall, and the seizure of Thessaloniki by them only hastened Constantinople's demise.⁷²²

The control and dominance of strategic ports and harbours in former areas of the Byzantine Empire by Ottoman Turks and Latins was another major factor, an issue that the Byzantines constantly had to confront and attempt to recompense.⁷²³ The fact that these ports were under foreign control was a cause of fiscal depletion, and the need to regain these ports was to be of vital fiscal and military importance for the beleaguered Byzantine Empire.⁷²⁴

The example of the liberating of the city and port of Patras by the Byzantine forces, which was for some years governed by the Latin Archbishop, had diminished the revenue that was drastically needed for the City of Constantinople. This indicated the need to enter dialogue with the Papal powers to expedite these political and fiscal matters. Even though some had positive political gain, these constant skirmishes and the subsequent loss of all of possessions in southern Greece, plus the additional expenditure having to go to war so as to regain the lost possessions, only hastened the depletion of the finances of the Empire.⁷²⁵ This had further repercussions, for, as previously stated,

⁷²² Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 374-375; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 261.

⁷²³ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 348. The control of ports and harbours by Ottoman Turks was a crucial factor, but so too was the effect of Latins controlling the vital harbours of Modon, Coron and Nauplion. Carlo Tocco, ruler of Cephalonia and Epiros, had seized control of Clarenza on the west coast of the Morea. It was to come under the control of the Byzantines again by the besieging and capturing of the city and port of Patras by Despot Constantine in 1429.

⁷²⁴ Franz Miklosich & Joseph Müller, 'Acts and Greek Diplomacy in the Medieval Period, Sacred and Profane', [Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi: Sacra et Profana], *Collecta et Edita*, vol.6 (Aalen: Scientia Verlag 1968), 129.

⁷²⁵ Revenue that was so necessary to support the defence of 'The City', as Constantinople is called, was actually non-existent. The final casualty in Byzantium's imminent demise can be argued to lie in the events commencing with northern Greece and resulting in Morea. In 1430 the city of Thessaloniki had fallen again into Turkish hands. Thessaloniki having come again under Turkish control was the final harbinger of the imminent danger to the Byzantine Empire and to the City of Constantinople. The dispatching of Turkish troops to devastate southern Greece by Turhan Bey in 1429, together with the retaking of Thessaloniki by the Turks in March 1430, could not be a clearer indication of what was to

their weakness allowed foreign powers to dominate.⁷²⁶ It was not surprising that the subject of the need for assistance was the main topic of discussion among the Byzantines, over and above that of the Union of the churches at the Council of Florence and the reason why Emperor John VIII started proceedings for a council to convene as early as 1430.⁷²⁷

A clear understanding of these events is reflected in Scholarios' correspondence, in which he constantly alludes to the encroaching Ottoman threat.⁷²⁸ The failure of any positive assistance, both financially and militarily, must have had a far-reaching consequence for Scholarios, and this is reflected in the despondent attitude of his correspondence in 1430 to Emperor John VIII, where he writes with a real sense of hopelessness. This sense of hopelessness is repeated in his lamentation letter of January 1452, on the proclamation of the Union, where he discusses the retribution that God has visited upon the Empire and City of Constantinople.⁷²⁹

befall Constantinople; Philip Mansel, *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453-1924* First US edition. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 27-32.

⁷²⁶ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Vol. Two, 686; "the economic might of the west in Byzantium was ended by the victorious advance of the Ottoman Turks; gradually they took possession of Constantinople and the rest of the Empire, of Trebizond and the northern shores of the Black Seas"; Laiou, *The Byzantine Economy*, 224.

⁷²⁷ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-Jean, his disciple about the Syllogism', [A Jean, son disciple, à propos du syllogisme], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 411-433; Scholarios, 'On the need to rescue Constantinople', vol. I., 296; Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 227-269; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 347; Angeliki E. Laiou, 'The Palaiologoi and the World around Them 1261-1400', in *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c 500-1492* ed. Jonathan Shepard, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 803-833.

⁷²⁸ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic', vol. III. 1-4. The emphasis of these statements by Gregoras and Bryennios could suggest it was solely an issue of the growing multi-cultural influence. But on the contrary, it indicates the effects of the multi-cultural influence were precipitated by the eradication of fiscal subsistence towards the Eastern Empire, as she relied on this expenditure for her military assistance; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 149-183.

⁷²⁹ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic', 'A Note Address to the Ecclesiastical opponents of Union', [Billet adressé aux ecclésiastiques adversaires de l'union (15 novembre 1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 167; Scholarios, 'Antilatin polemic-Manifest address to the inhabitants of Constantinople (November 27, 1452)', [Manifeste adressé aux habitants de Constantinople (27 novembre 1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. III. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1930), 171; Scholarios, 180. There are a series

Scholarios' correspondence in the period prior to the Council advocated a positive attitude towards the Latins, and in this period his regular communication and his supplication for the assistance for the City is noticable. His letter on the need for peace and assistance argues for the need to reverse the financial depletion of Byzantium, in addition to the desired military aid.⁷³⁰ Scholarios eventually hopes to see assistance from the Latins, and he was constant in that desire, even after the so called 'coerced Union', at the Council of Florence in 1439.⁷³¹

By the date of Scholarios' letter to Despot Dimitrios Palaiologos 1450, the failure to secure any assistance and the growing threat that is evolving due to the encroaching and dominant power of the Ottoman Turks, is a point of emphasis.⁷³² In the same year, 1450, Scholarios' two letters to Emperor Constantine caution him not to expect any deliverance from the Latins, as does the letter dated 1452 (recipient unknown), which follows a similar despondent theme.⁷³³

of letters during this period, prior of the capture of the City of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in May 1453, to the Imperial Authorities and generally to the inhabitants of the City of Constantinople, articulating the anguish over the proclamation of the Union and its consequences. See from 166- 180.

⁷³⁰ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol. Two, 678, 681. All the events and situations that orchestrated the ultimate collapse of the Byzantine Empire are summarized by Vasiliev as follows: "the humiliating voyages to western Europe of the emperors (John V, who was arrested at Venice for debt, Manuel II, and John VIII, undergoing similar abasement in having to pay tributes, forced stays at the Turkish sultans in various forms), the payment of tribute, forced stays at the Turkish court, and the giving of the princesses in marriage- all this weakened and degraded the power of the Byzantines Basileus in the eyes of the people."

⁷³¹ Scholarios, 'Funerary Eulogies', vol. I. 276, 284, 325.

⁷³² 'Demetrius Paleologue against the Union of Florence', vol. III. 117; Scholarios, 'Liturgics and Poetic Works- Prayer for the Deliverance of Peloponnesos', [Prière pour la délivrance du Péloponèse (1452)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol. IV. eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 348. Although most of Scholarios's philosophical and theological works would suggest the contrary, it is clear here that Scholarios's work was almost entirely politically motivated. In the beginning of '*The prayer for deliverance of Peloponnesos*' dated 1452, he gives thanks in supplication to God in the past: "He did not deliver His City into the hands of the Agarinous"—the Ottoman Turks. He is aware that the immediate danger of the dreaded moment is palpable. However, the prayer goes on to state that the desperate plight of the situation was due in no small part to the sins of the people in advocating union with the Latins and also alluding to the lapse of a few into ethics of paganism.

⁷³³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Emperor Constantine (1450)', vol. IV. 463; Scholarios, 'Letters signed-To Emperor Constantine (from the end of 1450) [A l'empereur Constantin (à partir de la fin de 1450)]', in

The anti-Union polemical work dated 1452 encapsulates Scholarios' emphatic anti-Union stance, particularly when in juxtaposition with Emperor Constantine's re-declaration of the Union in 1452. Scholarios issues a polemical treatise as to the folly of this endeavour, and in the subsequent correspondence his anti-Union stance is repeated more than once to the Despot Dimitrios and to his brother Emperor Constantine.⁷³⁴ There is marked contrast in his approach to Union here, considering the correspondence of his early years, where he expressed his hopeful desire for the success of the Union. The correspondence ten years or so after the Council adopts a definite anti-Union stance.⁷³⁵

It is remarkable that not once does Scholarios remark on the Filioque Clause. Later on, he will write voluminous amounts on this topic, to repudiate the application of its use in the Roman Church. The aspiration expressed by Scholarios in the hope for Union would definitely imply that Scholarios is willing to conform to the imperial policy of Union, but also the hope that what that Union will entail is assistance for the City.⁷³⁶ What is evident here, based on his earlier letters, is a more favourable interrelationship with the Latins both by the imperial bureaucracy and by Scholarios than is generally acknowledged.⁷³⁷

Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios, vol.IV, eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 474.

⁷³⁴ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Letter to Dimitrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence, 1450', vol.III.117, 136,152,166.

⁷³⁵ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Despot Theodore- The Same (before the departure for Italy) - to the priest Bessarion and to Pope Eugenius IV', vol. IV.417-421, 432.

⁷³⁶ Ibid. 414v14, 436v10. A more detailed clarification will be given in the next chapter concerning Scholarios and his correspondence in this earlier period. Scholarios implies that this work, which was increasingly to take him away from his studies and into political affairs, was not welcomed by him, but its dominance signifies that he was commissioned by the Emperor John in the preliminary studies for the Council.

⁷³⁷ Ibid. 413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 306. The claim that there is a lack of any opinion on the subject of union in Scholarios' writing overlooks the fact that an orator or a member in service of the court could not advance his own personal opinion. Blanchet, along with all other commentators on this subject, points out the absence of any notations about the Union by Scholarios or on the prospect of

Any insight about Scholarios' position toward the Union and the Latins, other than the letters stated above, is not derived directly from Scholarios' works, but primarily from Sylvester Syropoulos' *Memoires*. Scholarios' lack of stated opinion on Union and his favourable pro-Latin opinions or comments on the Council, can be understood only in terms of the political bureaucratic policy.⁷³⁸ Or it maybe that Scholarios, commenting on his response to the proceedings of the Council in his works a few years after the event, adjourned his strategy to attempt to justify his involvement in attempts to bring about Union of the churches at the Council in 1438–1439. Scholarios only advocated his anti-Union sentiments when the political scenario of pro-Unionist influence waned; this could be read as a deliberate reworking of his reports on the actual proceedings of the Council.

In reality, Scholarios aspires to the achievement of the Union, which reflects the political expectations noted in 1436 and a more than favourable opinion towards the Latins.⁷³⁹ There could not be any doubt that Scholarios' priorities were always political, before he took the monastic habit.⁷⁴⁰ It is significant that Scholarios implies that God seems to have abandoned His people due to this false Union, in the same year that

the meeting of an Ecumenical Council in particular. Blanchet observes that Scholarios appears to have avoided publicly pronouncing on this subject, up to the point where the Emperor sought his opinion, on the eve of the departure of the Byzantine delegation to the Italy, but even then he avoids expressing any personal opinion. Reluctance to articulate an opinion on Union supports the claim about Scholarios's own political aspiration, since any opinion other than that which was desired would immediately eliminate Scholarios from attending the Council or more precisely continuing in the service of the Emperor. The Emperor sought military aid from the Latins. Any disagreement with this policy would inevitably bring the disfavour of the Emperor, under whose power Scholarios served

⁷³⁸ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 51.

⁷³⁹ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 281. Scholarios's opinions about the Union in General or the prospect of the meeting of an Ecumenical Council in particular are very rare. Scholarios appears to have avoided as much as possible any public pronouncement on this subject, to the point where the Emperor sought his opinion urgently, on the eve of the departure of the Byzantine delegation to Italy. It is therefore necessary to examine texts of very different kinds to glean scattered clues to his position on the proposed Union. From this perspective, Scholarios' early formative years are of early particular interest, and it is essentially from his correspondence that it is possible to find some traces of his opinion on the future Council.

⁷⁴⁰ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Letter to Dimitrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence, 1450', vol. III.117–119.

Emperor Constantine is re-enforcing the Union. Clearly Scholarios was conscious of the political consequences that this Union will engender, in terms of a response from the Ottoman Turks.⁷⁴¹

6.5 Relationship between Respective Cultures

The relationship of Byzantine and Latin was always governed by the economic and military realities over the centuries, a fact that never diminished and would have significant impact on the Byzantines. The cultural change was realised more noticeably among the elites of the society rather than the average person, due to the power of the conservative religious forces.⁷⁴² This foreign cultural influence would have impacted on Scholarios in his initial studies, however.⁷⁴³

The Greek translations of Latin works that were the introduction to Scholarios' Western scholarship would suggest a theological framework for the ensuing political problems.⁷⁴⁴ The cultural impact of such debates helps to explain why Scholarios wanted to open the Greek eyes to the advances of Latin scholarship, and this suggests a more than usual admiration of the Latins on the part of Scholarios, particularly given his desire to find service with the Roman Curia.⁷⁴⁵

The progressive deployment of Western scholarship, primarily in theological studies, included not only Aquinas (whose work, as we have seen, Scholarios consistently reworks in his own writing), but also the eminent theologian Augustine, whom the East

⁷⁴¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 371.

⁷⁴² Kazhdan, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, 172-173, 185-186.

⁷⁴³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 281-295. See opening of this chapter on the issue of the letters plus Chapter Four and in Chapter Five which will be discussed further.

⁷⁴⁴ Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 424.

⁷⁴⁵ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV. 432.

normally avoids quoting. Scholarios was also acquainted with Peter Lombard and John Duns Scotus, and refers to the Scotus or Franciscan school, claiming that their theories on the procession of the Holy Spirit were more in keeping with the Orthodox view, a point of view that is upheld by Petit.⁷⁴⁶

One particular topic is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception that Scholarios discusses; even though he credits it to Augustine's theological writings, it was strongly supported by the Franciscan school of Duns Scotus.⁷⁴⁷ Further evidence for the deployment of Western scholarship is to be found in the translation of methodological works on logic by Peter of Spain⁷⁴⁸ and Gilbert de la Porrée.⁷⁴⁹ Scholarios cites works on logic and physics by Boethius and Albert the Great, providing further examples of western influences.⁷⁵⁰ The fact that Scholarios is utilizing sources from Western scholarship reinforces the claim that Western influences were entrenched in the academic elite of the Byzantine society.⁷⁵¹

In summary, Latin language and literature are synonymous with the promotion of the political agenda, and this is also evident in Thomas Aquinas' philosophical reappropriation of Aristotelianism. The political correlation between philosophy and Latinism is apparent, since Emperor Kantakouzinus sent Dimitrios Kydonis to the West

⁷⁴⁶ Scholarios, 'Introduction', vol.I. xlv; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 427; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 22, 61–62.

⁷⁴⁷ Livanos, *Greek tradition and Latin Influence*, 20; Geanakoplos, *An Orthodox View of the Councils of Basel*, 317.

⁷⁴⁸ Scholarios, 'Commentaries on the Paper of Interpretation' [Commentaire du livre sur l'interprétation], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.VII.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1936) ,283–337; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 427.

⁷⁴⁹ Scholarios, 'Translation 'sex principiis' of Gilbert of the Porrée', [Traduction du 'De sex principiis' de Gilbert de la Porrée], vol.VIII.338–350.

⁷⁵⁰ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-The Cause of the Schism', vol.II. 9; Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium and the Renaissances. Greek Scholars in Venice. Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*. Hamden CT: Archon Books, 20-27.

⁷⁵¹ Scholarios, 'Second Trait on the Origin of the Soul', [Second traité sur l'origine de l'âme], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 501.

and fostered the learning of the philosophical speculations of Thomas Aquinas. Psemmenos confirms this position in his edition of Greek philosophy; he sets out the intimate correlation between philosophy and politics. In the example provided, he clearly demonstrates the argument of the Prosferontas in Psemmenos' work by stating "that offering all duties – the Byzantines to the Latins – is to convince them that they should co-operate in all endeavours to achieve their political goal".⁷⁵²

This statement can also be applied to the Latins, for in order to achieve their own political goals, the Scholastic revision of philosophy and theologies were utilized. Into this political scenario entered groups of merchants and clergy who utilized the spread of Latin influence to promote their own personal agendas. These included the preoccupation with and pursuit of classical Greek philosophy. As C. M. Woodhouse states in his work on Gemistos Plethon; "Wealthy merchants and even churchmen were active students of the Greek classics".⁷⁵³ Although the Italians were not versed in Greek, the majority of Byzantines were not well versed in Latin or in the dialectics of the Italian language at that time either, yet still each culture interweaves into the other culture, to some degree.⁷⁵⁴

Woodhouse suggests however that the lack of fluency was not universal; for example, Leonardo Bruni as Chancellor of the Signoria welcomed the Byzantines, "with fluent speech in their own language"⁷⁵⁵, and the humanist Chrysoloras also spoke fluent Latin and Italian, as did Scholarios.⁷⁵⁶ Even though there was cross-pollination between their respective cultures, there was also a hesitancy to learn each other's languages. It is

⁷⁵² Psemmenos, *Greek Philosophy from 1453 to 1821*, 55–56.

⁷⁵³ Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon*, 155.

⁷⁵⁴ Kazhdan, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, 170; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 149–159.

⁷⁵⁵ Kazhdan, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, 170.

⁷⁵⁶ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 309.

clear, however, that greater knowledge of each others' languages would have aided greater reciprocal understanding between the cultures. The lack of understanding and the general misrepresentation of the theological debates that occurred at the Council in Florence might have been avoided.⁷⁵⁷ There were a few who, motivated by academic learning rather than politics, transmigrated to other cultures, and, while primarily motivated by their interest in language and philosophy, they subsequently delved into the others' respective theologies as well.

The Italian city states dominated the commercial and political interests in mainland Greece, and had established fiefdoms and dominated strategic ports to facilitate their interests in the Mediterranean and Black Seas and in the imperial City of Constantinople. Hence, it was advantageous for the Byzantines to focus on the political relationship with the West. Thus the cultural intermingling gained greater significance because of its potential economic impact.

Soon after the reclaiming of Constantinople by Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos from the Latins in 1261, the Emperor was confronted by the threat from the West, particularly from an intended invasion by Charles Anjou. The political strategy deployed to avoid this threat from the West took two forms; dialogue with the West, which for the Papal Authority meant Union with the Roman Church, and imperial propaganda to secure the most successful diplomatic profile for negotiations.

Scholarios' relationship with the West must be understood, not only within the context of this philosophical and theological movement that the West sought, but also within the political context, (which emphasizes the commercial and trade interests), and the religious impact these disciplines had on Byzantium. The political situation dictated the

⁷⁵⁷ Kianka, *Dimitrius Cydones*, 2.

need for cultural exchange on both sides, which Psemmenos confirms by stating that this philosophical interest actually capitulates to a political agenda. A political agenda is to be interpreted as the avenue by which the assimilation of the Byzantines into the Latin or Western tradition was to be accomplished.

6.6 Latin Language and Literature

We must now consider the further implications of the process of Latinization. Scholarios' support for the question of Union is accredited to a love of Western Latin culture, and his hesitancy about Union is attributed to his Orthodox theological commitment, which supposedly acted as a deterrent factor. However, this claim can be questioned. His later correspondence and writing in relation to political events suggests that this was not the case.

Scholarios adapted to the political change but remained an ardent follower of the Western church fathers. The fact that his practice of quoting and reflecting their writings to elaborate the topics that were pertinent to him and pertinent to the politics and culture of the Byzantines, now under the yoke of foreign power, remained consistent, is a primary indicator of the real reasons for Scholarios' hesitation and final change.

It would be naïve to suggest that Scholarios' Latinization sprang solely from his love of Western Latin culture without any thought for the Union for political reasons.⁷⁵⁸ But it is also notable that Scholarios' partiality for a pro-Union stance, which is evidenced by his writings and letters, would have meant that any accusations of his pro-Latin or pro-

⁷⁵⁸ Loenertz, 'The Dominicans', 240–68; Loenertz, 'The Dominicans Establishments', 210–226; Gabriel Lohr, 'The Dominicans at the universities of Erfurt and Mainz', [Die Dominikaner an den Universitäten Erfurt und Mainz], *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 23, 1953, 236–74; Miltiades B. Efthimou, *Greeks and Latins on Cyprus in the thirteenth century*. (Brookline: Hellenic College Press, 1987), 69, 79, 89; Rautman, *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire*, 85.

Union sympathies from his fellow countrymen would have been warranted. This accusation of pro-Latin and pro-Union sympathies, which Syropoulos records in his *‘Mémoires’*, and the source of pro-Latin and pro-Union influence, could not have come about merely through Scholarios’ causal association with the Latin religious Orders in Constantinople.⁷⁵⁹

The accusation of Scholarios’ Latinization is not arbitrary⁷⁶⁰ but is linked to the strong anti-Union sentiment that existed in Constantinople during that period. In Scholarios’ defence against the accusation of Latinization, he outlines the various accusations that were made against him and subsequently tries to rebut each accusation. In trying to make himself clear, Scholarios indicates who he is addressing and most importantly, provides reasons for his previous actions. Certainly, clarifying his pro-Union sentiments would not have been necessary for those who were already pro-Unionists themselves, but only to those who held anti-Union sentiments.

It can be concluded that the discourse was written when the majority of those who remained in the City of Constantinople after 1448 were anti-Unionists, otherwise it would not have been necessary to write the letter of rebuttal. A key factor is that by this time the pro-Union Byzantines elites had mostly fled the City and departed for Latin-dominated areas or to the West. It seems, then, that Scholarios’ justification was necessary.⁷⁶¹ There were open hostilities between the Byzantines, the majority of whom were anti-Unionists, now that the pro-Unionists/Latinophile Byzantines had departed

⁷⁵⁹ Williams, *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas*, 8; Lull, ‘General Pontifical Epistle’, 270–82; Woodhouse, *George-Gemistos Plethon*, 143; Josef Macha, *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework Together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 198. (Roma: Institutem Orientalism Studiorum. 1974), 134–136; Anthony Bryer, *The Roman Orthodox World 1393–1492 in The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c 500–1492*, ed. Jonathan Shepard. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 852–872.

⁷⁶⁰ Scholarios, ‘Justification Discours of Scholarios accused of Latinism’, vol.I. .377.

⁷⁶¹ Ihor Ševčenko, *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World*, IX.

and were not a formidable force to be dealt with, and the growing the dominance of the Ottoman Turks.⁷⁶²

We can return to the example cited above of Scholarios seeking service with Western authorities and the Papal state. This has similarities with the case of Kydonis in 1299, as related by Kianka,⁷⁶³ just as Kydonis was influenced by a Dominican friar, a friend of Kydonis, so too a Dominican friar was, to some extent, having some influence on Scholarios in 1435, as Letter 15 indicates.⁷⁶⁴ Also to cite the example of Holobolos that is stated above is adequate indication of the flow of communication between the Latins and the Byzantines.⁷⁶⁵ The processes of bringing Latin cultural influences to bear on the Byzantines was motivated by a political or commercial agenda, that utilized Latin language, Latin literature and Latin theological speculations to fulfil Byzantine and Latin ambitions.⁷⁶⁶

⁷⁶² Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 376; For political and social thought see Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 24; Kallistos, (Timothy Ware) Bishop of Diokleia, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1-8, 23.

⁷⁶³ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 78-79. In the text that is presented above, there are some discrepancies that I have rectified. The colony that Kianka states is not across the Golden Horn, which would put the colony in the Asiatic side, but across the Galata to the north of the City of Constantinople, where the Genoese had established an enclave, known today as Galata-Pera. (Cirhangir, Beyoğlu).

⁷⁶⁴ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol. IV. 432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291; Glycofry di- Leontsini, *Demetrius Cydones as a translator of Latin Texts*. Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides. (Aldershot UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 185; Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews*, 33-40. Vose recently undertook a study of the Dominicans and their influence in Aragon that gives an indication of the scope of their proselytism. The implication is that Kydonis, Chrysobergis and Scholarios are being drawn to the West and to Thomistic theological speculations, which were followed especially by the Dominican mendicant order, and this emphasizes their prodigious influence.

⁷⁶⁵ Fisher, *Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation*. 95-96. See page 53 of this thesis.

⁷⁶⁶ An extensive coverage of this topic is to be found in the work of Nikoy Zaharopoulou, professor at the University Aristotle Thessaloniki, Greece, in his book *The Church in Greece under the Latin Rule*. To give one example, pages 110-111, he describes the total process of Latinization by the Roman Church, which resulted in the exclusion of all Orthodox clergy and the supremacy of the Latin clergy over the Orthodox faithful in the southern part of Greece. The book is dedicated to the influences of the Latins and their subsequent domination of the Roman Church to the exclusion of the Orthodox Church. Other examples of Latin domination are shown by Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 226-237, and in Steven Runciman *Mistra: Byzantine Capital of the Peloponnese* London: Thames and Hudson, 1980, 15-27; See also Nicol and *Necipoğlu*, in the above footnote 665; *Necipoğlu, Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 85-118.

The relationship between Byzantine and West (Latin) at this time is starkly reflected in Kianka's summary: Ignorance, distrust and misunderstanding.⁷⁶⁷ The process of overcoming the cultural and political differences in order to defeat a common foe had to be achieved by assimilation and adaptation.⁷⁶⁸ Both Kydonis and Scholarios sought to mitigate the divisions in order to resolve the political and fiscal problems that existed.⁷⁶⁹

Kydonis' problem in the face of the relationship between Byzantines and Latins was also something Scholarios experienced, as he sought to further his Latin scholarship.⁷⁷⁰ Both Scholarios and Kydonis experienced difficulties, in the labelling of their Latinization, in advocating the need for Latin Scholarship, in friendships with Latin clerics and the seeking of a position within the Western powers and Papal state.⁷⁷¹

Scholarios' zeal in his aspiration for political advancement did not place him in the camp of those who were anti-Union, but in the group of those who were pro-Union. This is because not all who studied and were pro-Union were branded Latinophile, as Scholarios was. Scholarios expressed his pro-Union sympathies openly: "And with this

⁷⁶⁷ Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 54, 80; Meyendorff, *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*, 141; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 276-278.

⁷⁶⁸ Scholarios, 'The Cause of the Schism', vol.II.2. Two examples of this are, first, Scholarios's commentary on Thomas Aquinas, which introduced the latter's work to the Orthodox East, and second, Scholarios's attempt to respond to the theological debates presented by the Latins at the Council of Florence as found in his *Volumes II and III*. In Volume II, Scholarios discusses the cause of the schism between the Churches, and in the same volume he discusses the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Volume III articulates the errors committed at the said Council of Florence and especially advocates the Orthodox view of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

⁷⁶⁹ Turner, *The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios*, 426; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 82. It is instructive to consider the political situation that had transpired in the previous century under Emperor John Kantakouzenos and his relationship with the encroaching Ottoman Turks, which provided a reason to send Kydonis to the West, in order to study Latin literature. Kianka states that initially Dimitrios Kydonis's study of Latin literature was to the future advantage of the Byzantines; "in the knowledge of Latin and of Latin theology in their dealings with the Pope and with Western Europe" against their common foe the Ottoman Turks.

⁷⁷⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 29. Scholarios's relationship with the Latins cannot really be understood other than through the scope of the political aspirations that were anticipated by Byzantines and Latins alike. The adaptation of Aristotelian philosophical speculations, primarily as found in Thomas Aquinas's theological writings, intruded into the very fibre of Byzantine society and influenced individuals who reshaped the culture.

⁷⁷¹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV.432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

pleasure I espouse, adhere to and respect, in and relating to that of Union and of the way the Union will bring...”⁷⁷² The underlying motive for accusing someone of being a Latinophile must be more significant than the surface of the accusation itself.

Kydonis not only distinguished himself in self-study of the Latin language and the study of Latin literature, but also excelled in this endeavour with the help of Dominicans living in Galata-Pera. This is also where Scholarios seems to have obtained help.⁷⁷³ Scholarios however was praised for excelling in the study of Latin and Latin literature without any inference of influence, thus he was able to avoid any association or mention of the Latin religious Orders, despite the enormous influence they were exerting in the Imperial City.

It is highly unlikely that he learned Latin by himself, as Turner claims, but he avoids any mention of relationships with these Orders in order to avoid possible repercussions in terms of the accusation of being a Latinophile, when he later wanted to create an image of himself as always having been anti-Unionist.⁷⁷⁴ In any case, it was not until 1445, five years after the Council of Florence, that he began to show his anti-Union sentiments, when certain political events would dictate Scholarios’ change in view.⁷⁷⁵ The phrase, “and the way Union will bring”, was formed out of political expedience and

⁷⁷² Scholarios, ‘On Being and Essence- to Matthew Kamariotis’, vol. VI, 179-180. In this section Scholarios states that he had great admiration for St. Thomas and that his opinions and sympathies were greatly influenced by those who were wearing the habit of Francis.

⁷⁷³ Mercati, ‘Information of Procoros and Dimitrios Kydonis’, 125; Loenertz, ‘The Dominicans Establishments’, 209–219; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 78. Kianka, in her dissertation on Dimitrios Kydonis, denotes the close relationship with Latin clerics in Pera. She says, “his response to this common problem of communication between Byzantine and Latin was to study the language himself and, as he says, to rely on his own skills rather than on the dubious skills of the official interpreters. Despite the disapproval and negative predictions of some of his associates at the imperial court, Kydonis succeeded in learning Latin with the assistance a Dominican living in Pera, a Genoese colony across towards the northern part of the City, known as Galata.” See above footnote 706 on my modifications to this location.

⁷⁷⁴ Mercati, ‘Information of Procoros and Dimirios Kydonis’, 101, 161. The influence of the Latin religious Orders are emphasized as well as the growing menace of the Ottoman Turks.

⁷⁷⁵ Constantine N.Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence*, (New York: Centre of Byzantine Research 1979), 66, 73, 93.

could not be realized unless the Union was consummated according to the conditions demanded by the West and the Roman Church.

If Scholarios was accused of being Latinophile merely because he ardently supported the Emperor's policy on Union, then this seems illogical, since it would also apply to the Emperor, the entire assembly at the the court and all who aspired to reciprocal cultural interchange, and the allegation of being Latinophile was never asserted against them.⁷⁷⁶ The accusation of Latinism and Unionism against Scholarios was advanced by conservative circles in Constantinople, in a manner reminiscent of the equivalent denunciation against Kydonis in the fourteenth century.⁷⁷⁷

Kydonis and Scholarios, who both demonstrated pro-Latin sentiments, were held in contempt by groups who were vehemently anti-Latin, not only for their pro-Latinism but also for their vigorous application of theological opinions of pro-Unionism.⁷⁷⁸ This suggests the reason for Scholarios' lengthy letter of justification and rebuttal of his previous pro-Union sentiments.⁷⁷⁹

The relationship between Byzantines and the West cannot be viewed merely in terms of attempts to secure commercial and/or political advantage, but must be considered together with the cultural exchange, which both motivates and re-inforces the

⁷⁷⁶ Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, vol.II.718–9. Manuel Chrysoloras, an eminent teacher, rhetorician and philosopher who was ordered by the Emperor on a special political mission to Italy, was received enthusiastically by them; so much so, that he was invited to hold positions for several years at Universities of Florence, Milan and Pavia. His fame was so well known, the renowned Italian humanist Guarino was known to have travelled to Constantinople before Chrysoloras's ordered departure to Italy by the Emperor.

⁷⁷⁷ This passage reflects the political aspect of the religious problem that divided the Churches, which was an accommodation, or a mutual need for union between the two communities viewed by the East and the West so as to arrive at a collective bond. The need is accentuated by the use of the word *accommodation* or as Blanchet writes, *economy*.

⁷⁷⁸ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 285.

⁷⁷⁹ Scholarios, 'Justification Discours of Scholarios accused of Latinism', vol.I.376.

philosophical heritage.⁷⁸⁰ Additionally, any political agreement between Latins and Byzantines would be sharply opposed by those individuals who favoured appeasement with the Ottoman Turks. They would not have desired a close affiliation with the Latins, since that would have agitated the Ottoman Turks.⁷⁸¹ Scholarios' nomination as Patriarch by the Sultan Mehmet after the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks was to guarantee that no effort to secure Union would be ever considered at some future date, and Scholarios anti-Union stance made that even less likely.

Having stated this, all interest in philosophical discussion and debate was not solely motivated by political aspirations, but also terms of the quest for exchange and knowledge of higher learning; and there was a genuine acknowledgement of the renewal of classical tradition, particular in science and philosophy.⁷⁸² Scholarios and Kydonis were a part of this cultural exchange, but what set them apart was their political motivation.⁷⁸³

⁷⁸⁰ Marios Philippides, *Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century*. The Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources, No. 13. (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1990), 24-135. The entire book is a chronicle account of the relationship between the Byzantines and Ottoman Turks. See: 57-69; Nadia Maria el Cheikh, *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 189. This chapter explains the communications of the Byzantines with the Arabs. One notable feature is the lack of any affirmation or mention of the Ottoman Turks. It indicates also the precarious relationship with Latins as well other minority groups.

⁷⁸¹ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 390; Stephen W. Reinert, 'Fragmentation (1204-1453)', in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. Cyril Mango (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 248.

⁷⁸² Angelov, 29; Scholarios, 'The Cause of the Schism', vol.II. .2; Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Manifest Addressed to the inhabitants of Constantinople', [Manifeste adressé aux habitants de Constantinople], vol.III. 1-100, 171 Scholarios's relationship with the Latins cannot be understood other than through the scope of the political aspirations that were anticipated by Byzantines and Latins alike. The adaptation of Aristotelian philosophical writings, primarily as found in Thomas Aquinas's theological speculations, intruded into the very fibre of Byzantine society and influenced individuals who reshaped the culture.

⁷⁸³ Scholarios, 'Apologetic Writings addressed to the Mohammedans', vol.III., 432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291; Kianka, *Demetrius Cydones*, 137, 174, 222.

CHAPTER SEVEN – SCHOLARIOS’ CHANGE IN POSITION FROM PRO-UNION TO ANTI-UNION AT THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

In this chapter I will argue Scholarios’ ultimate change in position from pro-Union to anti-Union was governed primarily by his political aspirations and motivations. His choices can be viewed in light of his determined propagation of policies in the service of the Imperial Authority, and then later, in the consequences of political events in the period of 1441–1445, that were to be the catalyst leading to Scholarios’ ultimate radical change.

How do we begin to comprehend the reason behind Scholarios’ change of view from pro-Union to anti-Union? It has been suggested in this thesis that he was motivated by political policies. I have established that his initial reason for studying philosophy and theology was that these subjects were strategic elements in the implementation of these policies. To confront the Latins in the scholastic debates, individuals who were well versed in philosophy and theology were needed.⁷⁸⁴ I argue the political events from the period of 1441 to 1444, dominated by the Ottoman Turks’ expansionism and their reaction to the Byzantines, was the catalyst to Scholarios’ change of view on Union.

The preliminary studies ordered by the Emperor from 1430–1435, prior to the Council of Florence, supports the hypothesis that the Byzantines and the Imperial Court were

⁷⁸⁴ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letter- to an unknown’, vol.IV, 437.

trying to achieve military aid against the Ottoman Turks, at the price of Union.⁷⁸⁵ However, the West was divided between supporters of papal supremacy and the Conciliar Movement, each desiring to gain the advantage in expediting Union with the Byzantines. There was a great advantage for them in the Union with the Byzantines; as through Union, political and theological dominance over the East could be gained. Such dominance meant not only economic benefits, trade and commerce for secular powers, but most importantly the ecclesiastical motivation was the liberation of the Holy Land and the conversion of the Mohammedans to the Roman Church, in addition to the conversion of the Orthodox Christians.⁷⁸⁶

I have suggested that in 1358 Kydonis was in communication with, and influenced by, the Latin religious foundations in Constantinople in his pursuit of his studies. It can be suggested that similarly Scholarios was influenced in his pursuit of studies of Latin Literature, even while claiming to be autodidactic.⁷⁸⁷ Kydonis and Scholarios had one common bond—their strong position on preventing the ascendancy and dominance of Ottoman Turkish forces. We cannot avoid the conclusion that for the Byzantines, the Council was convened in 1438–9 for one specific reason, with a preordained outcome, namely Union with the end result of obtaining military aid and assistance to defend the City of Constantinople. In retrospect, Scholarios' beginnings in service with the imperial bureaucracy would indicate a coordinated strategy towards one purpose, and that was to facilitate the political desires of the emperor.

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid. 415; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 112; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 283–316; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 107–121; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 184.

⁷⁸⁶ P. Thomas, *General Councils of the Church*. (Bombay: St Paul Publications, 1993), 89.

⁷⁸⁷ Kianka, *Demetrios Cydones*, 78–92; Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol.IV. 432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 293. An example is the forwarding of a letter destined for the Pope, the letter presented by Scholarios to the Catholic parish priest of the church in Pera, indicates Scholarios in his early letters was not unobtrusive about the subject of union, but particularly deployed a political attitude, as annotated in the third and sixth chapters of this thesis.

The political situation evolving due to the events ten to twelve years before the Council sets the scene for the reason for the Council. Examination of the letters prior to the Council of Florence in 1438–9, demonstrate the perceived urgency of convening the Council, but also indicates the extent to which both Scholarios and the imperial authorities were themselves very keen for the Council to convene. The Byzantine Empire had seen its dominions diminish in the middle and last period of the fifteenth century, firstly due to intrusions made by the Latins, and subsequently by the Ottoman Turks. Foremost among the long list of events that culminated in the need for the Council of Florence was the capture of Thessaloniki by the Ottoman Turks.

In the second phase, after many political skirmishes between Latins, Byzantines and Ottoman Turks, was the subsequent long-expected ultimate threat of the conquest of Constantinople, foreshadowed in 1422 by Murad II.⁷⁸⁸ Included in this phase of the domination by the Ottoman Turks over the former Byzantine areas was the punitive expedition to southern Greece destroying the Hexamilion wall, first in 1423 and later the dispatching of Turkish troops to devastate southern Greece by Turhan Bey in 1429.

The procurement of political dominance was assisted by the Ottoman Turks deliberately procrastinating about any settlement, and by extorting threats and tributes from the defenders of besieged cities to bring about the eventual capitulation to Turkish control, which was the norm.⁷⁸⁹ The retaking of Thessaloniki by the Turks in March, 1430, could not be a clearer indication of what was to befall Constantinople, bearing in mind

⁷⁸⁸ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 346–367; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 326–337. Latins controlled the vital harbours of Modon, Coron and Nauplion, but the Ottoman Turks had dominated all her eastern possessions in Asia Minor; Runciman, *Mistra, Byzantine Capital of the Peloponnese*, 70–71; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 261.

⁷⁸⁹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 347. Seven years earlier, the Venetians had taken over Thessaloniki, which was regarded by Byzantines as their major second city. Hailed as saviours by the populace to build second Venice, they were constantly harassed when blockaded by 30,000 Turkish troops; Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453*. (New Haven. CT: Eastern Press, 1971), 328–329.

Thessaloniki had previously fallen to the Ottoman Turks on 9 April 1387.⁷⁹⁰ But perhaps it was beyond the imagination of the emperor and imperial authorities, and that of Scholarios that this could befall the Byzantine Empire.⁷⁹¹

As formerly stated, the predominance of foreign forces in the former Byzantine territories, with control of ports and harbours, significantly diminished the avenue of revenue needed to support the defence of the City and the Empire. Wars were expensive undertakings that caused extra taxes and further economic encumbrance on the reserves of Byzantium. These constant skirmishes hastened the depletion of the fiscal and military situation of the Empire, even though there was some positive political gain in the re-obtaining of possessions in the former territories.

The punitive expeditionary forces of Turkish troops under Turhan Bey that devastated southern Greece in 1429, and the retaking of Thessaloniki by the Turks in March 1430, are conclusive motives for Emperor John VIII to send emissaries to Latin-Western powers, primarily to the Roman Church to convene a council on the Union of the churches, in the hope of aid.⁷⁹² The constant intimidation, coercions and manipulations manifested in the events in the period prior to the convening of the Council, propagated the need for a council to be convened. The exacerbation of the political situation galvanized the need for assistance to be main topic of discussion, as asserted by the Byzantines, over that of the topic of Union of the churches.⁷⁹³

⁷⁹⁰ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 348; Gill, *Eleven Emperors of Byzantium*, 82-83.

⁷⁹¹ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 338, 370-380; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 159.

⁷⁹² Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 351.

⁷⁹³ Ibid. 348-351.

7.1 Dialectic Political Manoeuvrings

The period of 1429 to 1430 when the Turkish undertook their punitive invasion into southern Greece and the retaking of Thessaloniki by the Turks would have coincided with the time of Scholarios' initial beginnings with the Imperial service. It helps to explain why Scholarios took an interest in Aristotelian rhetorical studies, for the purpose of political dialectic and dialogue. It is understandable, as Scholarios was well acquainted with the knowledge of the recent events in southern Greece and Thessaloniki, which would determine the course of his studies. For Scholarios, his service with the imperial bureaucracy had a political agenda, reflecting upon the events and in his correspondences.⁷⁹⁴

To reiterate, Scholarios political agenda can be discerned, paradoxically, in the apparent absence of any personal opinion other than that of the political imperial policy. The prime example is the lack of any substantive reference to the need for the Council to be convened, which would reflect a political agenda on the part of the Byzantines with the Latins. Any such discussion would need to be highly secretive, particularly to avoid this information reaching the Ottoman Turks.⁷⁹⁵ Because of these political intricacies, the emperor and the imperial bureaucracy, including Scholarios, were cautious about releasing any information that might hinder their strategy. It is understandable that

⁷⁹⁴ Scholarios 'Liturgic and Poetic Works-Prayer for the Deliverance of Peloponesos', vol.IV. 348; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 445; George E. Demacopoulos, 'The popular Reception of the Council of Florence in Constantinople 1439-1453', .43. 1 *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* (1999):38-39.

⁷⁹⁵ Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos*, 54-55. Nicol suggests the massacre of Laimokopia in 1452 was the beginning of the destruction of the Romans that is, the Byzantines.

Scholarios' correspondence and works would be focused on the imminent danger to the Byzantine Empire.⁷⁹⁶

In Scholarios' correspondence from an earlier period, discussed in chapter six, any reference to the subject of Union is absent. He rarely speaks on the subject, only commenting briefly in his Letter 8 in reference to the priest, Bessarion, in the year 1436.⁷⁹⁷ However, in retrospect, this can be attributed to the need to avoid recording any opinion to anyone who was in service with the imperial bureaucracy, and the need to avoid any personal opinion on political policy.⁷⁹⁸ The lack of political opinion, information about where the Council is to be held, and any recent information about the ongoing negotiations concerning the Council, would suggest that he is following two directives: first, to avoid leaking information of any political decision by the Byzantines and Latins to the Ottoman Turks, and secondly, to avoid articulating any opinion pertaining to political ideology.⁷⁹⁹

Scholarios' works also reflect the presence of the Turks, who opposed any effort of Union between the churches and who saw Union as direct opposition to their own political aspirations. A good example of this is demonstrated by the letter sent to Pope Urban VI by Patriarch Neilos which reflects the political intrigue and trepidation on any undertakings and dialogue with the West. The Patriarch replied to the topic of primacy concerning Union and then states "whatever correspondence comes to them goes

⁷⁹⁶ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 112, 116.

⁷⁹⁷ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the Priest Bessarion (beginning of 1436)', vol. IV. 419; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

⁷⁹⁸ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 61.

⁷⁹⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-John, his Disciple about the Syllogism', vol. IV. 410-412; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

through the Turks”.⁸⁰⁰ The correspondence had political implications; if the Eastern Church had accepted the authority of the Pope then it would demonstrate a joint coalition against the Turks. Union and recognition of the Pope’s primacy were politically precarious. There is an added observation to make: any political agreement between Latins and Byzantines would be sharply opposed by those individuals (Byzantine anti-Unionists) who favoured appeasement with the Ottoman Turks. They would not have desired a close affiliation with the Latins, since that would have agitated the Ottoman Turks.⁸⁰¹

This implies the existence of explicit, forceful motives on the part of the Turks regarding any movements made by the encircled Byzantines or the Latins of Constantinople and the Empire against them: “See however there would be war with the Turks and we are encircled.”⁸⁰² It is evident that any decision that was contrary to the Turks would be immediately met with hostile reprisal. The engagements of the Turks were considered a direct threat; they had captured Thessaloniki, destroyed the Hexmilion wall in the south, and invaded the Peloponnesos peninsula.

In terms of Scholarios’ political knowledge, Blanchet suggests that Scholarios held a somewhat lowly or minimal position in the service of the Imperial Authority which she suggests explains his lack of any information regarding the preparation of the Council.⁸⁰³ This does not seem to be a justified conclusion, however, particularly when, in a letter to the Pope in 1434–5, Scholarios reveals the hope and urgency of the

⁸⁰⁰ Franz Miklosich and Joseph Mueller, *Acta et Diplomata the Greek Middle Ages: the Sacred and the profane*, [Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi: Sacra Et Profana], Collecta Et Edita. 6 vols, (Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1968), vol. 2. 86–87; Syropoulos, *Vera Historia Unionis non verae*, 268.

⁸⁰¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 347–349. See, the siege of the City of Thessaloniki and Greeks aiding the Ottoman Turks; Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades. The Kingdom of Acre and the Latter Crusades*. vol.III. (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1951), 464–465.

⁸⁰² Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 112.

⁸⁰³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291.

council. In Blanchet's recent incisive research, primarily on the letters from the period of 1434–1437, we are given an enhanced image of Scholarios' actions during this period. His letter 4, in 1436, continues to emphasize that he “is full of hope in the Union and euphoric over the news of the forthcoming Council”.⁸⁰⁴ If there is absence of any early information on the council, I would suggest, it was due to the policies of the Imperial Authority.⁸⁰⁵

According to the letters examined previously in chapter six, Scholarios' letter to the Supreme Pontiff, Pope Eugene IV, presumably written in 1434, is a genuine reflection of Scholarios' political aspirations, where he is in agreement with the aspirations to achieve Union. He openly expresses these expectations on three occasions:

A/ in a letter to Pope Eugene IV, letter 15;⁸⁰⁶

B/ in another letter addressed to his pupil John, letter 5, dated the end of November 1435, appraising him as to where the Council is to be held;⁸⁰⁷

C/ in a letter without recipient, letter 18.⁸⁰⁸

Turner states that Scholarios implies a reluctance to be involved in the political arena in a letter to his student John dated 1435.⁸⁰⁹ If this was the case, it would suggest an odd

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid. 291. The exhilaration expressed by Scholarios would definitely imply political aspirations, since the news of the union defines political military assistance for the City of Constantinople. At the same time, this indicates conformity with the imperial policy of union, a position of subservience. This would indicate a political aspiration on the part of Scholarios other than the hope of the political reprieve the City was to receive, to be realized in the hope of what that union will achieve in receiving military aid.

⁸⁰⁵ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 18–19, 61. See in the advancement of rhetorical studies, noted in footnote 49. G.Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*; G.Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, 1983), 662–665.

⁸⁰⁶ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV’, vol. IV. 432; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 291. According to Blanchet, T.Ganchou dates the letter at the beginning of 1434.

⁸⁰⁷ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-The same to the Same’, vol.IV. 413; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 292. Dated the end of November 1435, appraising John as to where the Council is to be held.

⁸⁰⁸ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To an unknown’, vol.IV. 436; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 293. According T Zèsès, this is addressed to Bessarion in 1436, as Blanchet also notes.

contradiction in his seeking service with the imperial bureaucracy; as this work would increasingly take him away from his studies and into politics. As far as we can tell, this would be an unwelcome development because it would open up a conflict between his course of studies and his service with the imperial bureaucracy, which had a political agenda.⁸¹⁰ The evidence for the political facet of his service with the imperial bureaucracy is reflected in the fact that he was commissioned by the emperor for the preliminary studies for the preparation of Council, which would seem to confirm his political engagement.⁸¹¹

As in Scholarios' letter 15, the expression of hope for the performance of the Union is in a way more or less marked in these further letters of Scholarios, and is politically motivated. He addresses the Pope in early 1434, where he refers to the "project of Union" and appeals to the Pope "for the common good of the oecumène, without defining more specifically", nonetheless, he then recalls how his own *homeland* is in need of protection, partly by the *Supreme Pontiff* and partly by God. The significant aspect of this letter is the political necessity of aid for Constantinople and the the impression Scholarios gives of the perfect imperial official, reinforced by his choice of words.⁸¹² The picture Scholarios conveys of his reluctance to be taken away from his studies is not really credible. Our examination of the letters that have been annotated

⁸⁰⁹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-The same', [Τῷ αὐτῷ-Au meme (fin de 1435)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), vol.IV. 414. V.14. There are couple of letters that have the same title, precaution is needed, as to the date of the letters.

⁸¹⁰ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 65–77.

⁸¹¹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 403; Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 427.

⁸¹² Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Alexis Laskaris', [A Alexis Lascaris (1438)], vol.IV.436, v.10.

does not demonstrate outright reluctance, but suggests an altogether different personality with politically ambitious aspirations.⁸¹³

According to Turner, Scholarios had received titles as an official *Διδασκαλος* (*teacher*), and a member of the senate, which signify his worth and gradual advancement within the imperial bureaucracy. This is elucidated by Scholarios himself, and demonstrates elements of his political ambition. The letters reveal another facet of Scholarios, other than the submissive retainer under the imperial authority. As Blanchet elucidates, Scholarios' desires and wishes were anything but reluctance to feature in the political arena.⁸¹⁴ His actions suggest he was working actively within the apparatus of imperial political ideology.⁸¹⁵

7.2 Arrival of Ambassadors

An examination of the information in letter 5, in the preparation for the Council, suggests the accurate date for the arrival of Conciliarists delegates from the Council of Basel was the end of November 1435. However the dating is not completely certain,

⁸¹³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters', vol.IV. 413–432. In the reflection of these letters does suggest the political aspiration by Scholarios.

⁸¹⁴ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 314. In 1437, Scholarios comes across as an ambiguous persona with an abstract opinion of union. If his point of view appears to be relatively isolated, it is probably because of his *social status of applied laymen in the service of the Emperor*, which is additional proof of the difficulty with which he acquired acquiescence to the opinion of union. The opinion of Unionism is motivated, in an environment where, by training effects the majority who favour the Council draft. Scholarios appears in 1437 as strongly supportive both of the emperor and of the pope's policy of union, even though as is noted there are noticeable differences between its position, rather pragmatic conclusion, and that of Scholarios's contemporaries, monks or metropolitans, who seem to have a more abstract vision of what must be the Union.

⁸¹⁵ Ibid. For Scholarios, what motivates him is his political aspirations, which remain evident in his behaviour. Such aspirations are reflected especially in those in service of the Imperial Bureaucracy, who were naturally preferred because of their personal loyalty to the Emperor. The ascription of the title *Supreme Pontiff* in addressing the Pope in Scholarios's letter denotes that he acquiesces to the dictates of the Emperor's policy; Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 356.

and as Syropoulos states in Acts, was actually 24 September 1435.⁸¹⁶ A more precise examination of the events would show that the preparations for the Council commenced at an earlier date than Blanchet indicates. According to Nicol, soon after the elevation of the new Pope Eugenius IV, he had received Emperor John's ambassadors in 1431 for the express purpose of preparing dialogues on the topic of the Union of the churches. This would suggest that the immediate need for dialogue was recognised soon after the realization of the implication of events in Peloponnesos and Thessaloniki in 1428–1430.⁸¹⁷ At that time, the Conciliary movement was a primary concern in the West, particularly between the Pope and those who advocated conciliarism. Antecedents of conciliar thought appeared in the thirteenth century, in efforts to explore ways to counteract possible abuses in the growing power of the Papacy.

The Council fathers of Basel who convened to discuss this matter were also interested in the Byzantines communicating with them instead of the Pope, as they had invited the Byzantine delegates to address their appeal for assistance to this Council in order to underplay the authority of the Pope and to accentuate the power of the Conciliarists.⁸¹⁸ This was similar to the situation five years later, when three clerical delegates from the Council of Basel were sent to Constantinople, in the hope of minimizing the importance of the arrival of the papal legate who had arrived in November.⁸¹⁹ Vitalien Laurent, commenting on Syropoulos' *Mémoires*, gives specific evidence about when they

⁸¹⁶ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 292.

⁸¹⁷ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 352. See above section in this chapter on the political events.

⁸¹⁸ Joachim W. Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV, The Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire: The Conflict over Supreme Authority and Power in the Church*. Studies in the History of Christian thought; vol.13, (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1978), 43, 102-119. See. Stieber gives a clear account of the political haranguing and struggles of the pro-papal and anti-papal conflicts in the confines of the universities. Power play of the religious Orders against each another and particularly with the Papal Authority; Deno J. Geanakoplos, *An Orthodox View of the Council of Basel (1431-49) and of Florence (1438-1439) as Paradigm for the study of Modern Ecumenical Councils*. vol.30 no.3, (Brookline MA: Greek Orthodox Theological Review, 1985), 312-314.

⁸¹⁹ Scholarios 'Signed Letters-To the same (end of 1435)', vol. IV. 414; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 292.

(delegates from the Council of Basel) departed, and the date of their arrival in Constantinople, 24 September 1435.⁸²⁰

Scholarios also mentions the concurrent arrival of Christophe Garatoni, the papal legate, and the imminent departure of the latter at the time, when he is busy writing his letter.⁸²¹ The recording of the events at the beginning of the dialogues for the Union of the churches, taking place, according to Syropoulos, on 24 September 1435, and according to Blanchet, the end of November 1435, emphasizes the political strategy that is being enacted, not only by the West but also by the Byzantines.⁸²² Both Scholarios and Syropoulos provide details of the negotiations for the proposed assembly of the Council, where Scholarios indicates his personal involvement in discussions held between some laymen and ecclesiastical Byzantine figures and ambassadors of Basel, while Syropoulos provides an account of a direct discussion without Scholarios personal involvement. Scholarios depicts the position of Pope Eugene IV, as expressed by Garatoni: the Pope, "wishing the Union at any price" is ready to accept almost any conditions, in particular with regard to the place where the Council will be held. According to Syropoulos, who gives more detailed information on the discussions between the delegates from Bale and the Byzantines than that presented by Scholarios, the words that the Pope expressed are stated by the delegates from Bale, but particularly

⁸²⁰ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 130-132. The first of the delegates is frère John of Ragusa, Ραοῦζιου, second nomodidaskalos (νομοδιδάσκαλος) Henri Mancer, who Scholarios attributes as a Frenchman, hence Frantziskos (Φραντζίσκος) and the third being Simon Fréron, Vakalarios of theology (βακαλάριος τῆς θεολογίας : the letter β in Greek is V) Alamanos (Αλαμάνος). See: footnotes 10 in the *Mémoires*.

⁸²¹ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To the same (end of 1435)', vol.IV. 414; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 292.

⁸²² Ibid. 292.

remark that the question of where the Council was to be held was cause for much deliberation.⁸²³

A principal factor noted here is Scholarios' recording of the negative response to the remark by the Byzantines, regarding the proposal of the Pope to hold the Council in Constantinople. It is obvious that any Council in Constantinople would excite immediate Turkish involvement in the proceedings due to the Turkish presence in the City and in the surrounding areas of Constantinople.⁸²⁴ The remarks are left unexplained, without any reason for the Byzantine's rejection, other than they have "poorly operated." The implication behind these words could only mean a lack of political prudence on the part of the Latins, considering the political situation the Byzantines were experiencing with the Turks. In this observation then, Scholarios' lack of detail in this matter and his involvement in the proceedings are to be questioned. It is possible that there is an element of imperial ideology that is being enforced during proceedings here, to suppress the possibility of any direct confrontation with Ottoman Turks⁸²⁵

7.3 Political Implication of the Letters

Although the letters in question have been discussed in the previous chapter, indicating Scholarios' constant communications with the Latins, they also suggest a political motive and request, as I have observed. Scholarios' third letter number 18 demonstrates

⁸²³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Pope Eugenius IV', vol. IV.432 ; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 132; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Theology and Philosophy in Byzantium*, 127 : Podskalsky points out the difficulties in the translated texts that either Latins or Byzantines had received, which would motivate a further misunderstanding of each other.

⁸²⁴ Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 202.

⁸²⁵ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 132–133; Blanchet, 293. The Pope suggesting Bale for the Council; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 196, 208, 219.

his perceptive political acuity in his assessment of the situation in Sparta and the necessity for the preparation of the Council.⁸²⁶ Blanchet suggests that it is likely that the recipient of the letter is Bessarion. Two implications emerge in the details of the letter. One, it invites the recipient of the correspondence to return to Constantinople by order of the Emperor; Syropoulos attests the recipient to be Bessarion who is to return to the capital on the eve of the Council by order of John VIII.⁸²⁷ The second implication is that Scholarios wishes the recipient of the letter to convince “his Professor” (Plethon) who has effectively been selected and included into the Byzantine delegation leaving for Italy, to join him.⁸²⁸ This is more than a social oddity in writing to his friend; Scholarios seeks to persuade him to respond to the call of the Emperor and accept being part of the Greek delegation to the Council. If Bessarion and Plethon are not present, he says, “there is no one to support the Emperor in what he wants to achieve.”⁸²⁹

There are some uncertainties as to the style of this letter, for it is known that Plethon had pre-conceived conceptions in matters of religion. However he was very well known for his academic perspicacity, which would explain the reason he might have been obligated to attend. For Bessarion to be solicited to participate in the Council as an advisor to the Emperor is very unusual, due to the fact that Bessarion, together with Isidore and Eugenikos, were elevated to bishops prior to their departure for Rome. The implication here is that Scholarios is overplaying his own importance; bearing in mind he was not elevated to any position other than secretary.⁸³⁰

⁸²⁶ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 294. Blanchet clarifies; “If one accepts that the recipient of the letter is Bessarion, the date of the letter can be fixed with some precision: Scholarios failed, as he claims, to influence the Imperial decision to bring Bessarion before 1436, and Bessarion for his part arrived at Constantinople by late 1436; this is why the date of this letter should be the year 1436.”

⁸²⁷ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 276–277.

⁸²⁸ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 293.

⁸²⁹ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To an unknown’, vol.IV. 437.

⁸³⁰ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 294.

Blanchet's observations on the content of this letter and the other two letters (15 and 5) appear to be correct, giving the impression that Scholarios is considering the question of the Union primarily as a political problem in the context of the contemporary situation. It demonstrates an understanding of the need for the Council to be acquainted with the events unfolding, and Scholarios addresses it in terms of reports of forces.

The gradual demise of the prestige of the city is noted, even when not beleaguered by the Ottoman Turks; it had deteriorated to a poor state by 1435.⁸³¹ Anticipating the difficulties, Scholarios reflects on the political relations the Byzantines are experiencing with the Latins. He is unable to imagine a positive encounter between them and envisages a confrontation between the two camps. Scholarios hopes that the Union will come about, but is quite sceptical about its chances of success. He presents himself as a 'connoisseur' of the political policy of the time.⁸³² This observation will indicate Scholarios' policies were not difficult to understand, but were pre-meditated and were cognizant of the political situation, as would be required for a person in the imperial service with political aspirations.⁸³³

What is clear is that the Byzantines opened up a dialogue in their quest for ecclesiastical Union with Rome and the West for the sake of political stability, while concurrently experiencing a deteriorating relationship with the Turks.

The Turks saw this dialogue as open hostility towards themselves, since it appeared to be a political coalition of the Byzantines and the Latin West, aligned against them. The Sultan correctly assumed that the Council of Florence was nothing other than a pretext

⁸³¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 354. Palaces, churches and monasteries were in great need of repairs, a situation that continued even when Mehmed II conquered the City in 1453. Most especially, in 1435 the City experienced another outbreak of the plague, which validates the relatively pessimistic forecasts in light of the situation that existed in Constantinople.

⁸³² Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Despot Theodore', vol IV. 417.

⁸³³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 294,295.

for political manoeuvring against them. The rebuilding of the Hexamilion Wall at Corinth, the extension of Emperor John VIII's political power and authority over most of central Greece, the takeover of the City of Athens by the Despot Constantine in 1444 from the Latins, and the forcing of Duke Nerio II Acciaiuoli to pay tribute to Constantine instead of to Sultan Murad II show this assumption was correct. The Sultan, seeing the duplicity of both Latins and Byzantines, had to take necessary action against this threat; it resulted in the retaking of Thessaloniki, incursion into southern Greece by the Ottoman Turks and finally in the threat of capture of the City of Constantinople.⁸³⁴

Blanchet suggests all these "disparate circumstances" have a single explanation. Scholarios has very personal issues about the acceptability of Union, "because he knows the Latins particularly well, more precisely". Political familiarity in relationships with the Latins and Ottoman Turks makes anyone in the imperial bureaucracy aware what the reality of having a closer association with the Latins will entail. Scholarios' political aspirations are not put on hold, as Blanchet affirms, but are interwoven in the preparations for the Council.

Scholarios never lost sight of the objective of his aspirations. He was motivated by opinion, influenced by his political aspirations, in that he sought to find a middle course of recognition that would reconcile the two groups—Byzantines and Latins—against a common foe. It is possible to observe his search for a medium of commonality in an examination of the theological problem of the Filioque Clause, which he seeks to explore without offending either side.

⁸³⁴ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 350-368; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 191.

7.4 The Council and the “Economy” View of Union

The prerequisite for compromise was the stipulation that the Council process of discussion was compliant with the Union policy on economy. It was reminiscent of the memorable failure of the Union discussed at the second Council of Lyon 1274. It would accept the validity of the Filioque endorsed by Latinophile Byzantines and the Roman Church for reasons of political expediency.⁸³⁵

In his second proposal, Scholarios suggests that it would be sufficient to send a proposal reminiscent of the terms employed in the Union of Lyon, to the Pope, and so the possibility of compromise by economy is raised.⁸³⁶ We must concur with Blanchet’s question: For what option is Scholarios lobbying? It warrants the question: Were the Byzantines trying to find a convenient and moderate form of procedure on the theological questions without jeopardizing the main objective of obtaining military aid?⁸³⁷

It seems that any anti-Union sentiments observed in the second dialogue on the procession of the Holy Spirit are of a later period, when Scholarios was by then a monk at the monastery of the Harsianitis (Charsianitis) in 1449–1450.⁸³⁸ The remark about, “fancy ways to make peace and the way in which the Byzantines were misled, so as to arrive to the signing of the Decree of Florence”, suggest he is reflecting back on the

⁸³⁵ Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282*, 258; George E. Demacopoulos, ‘The Popular reception of the Council of Florence in Constantinople’, in *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 43, 1, (1999): 44-45.

⁸³⁶ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 170; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 311.

⁸³⁷ Scholarios is certainly part of the unionist camp prior to the Council in 1437, and his previous disagreements with the Emperor had faded. His hopes are also shared by many of his companions, probably even by the majority of those involved in the negotiations. The Council is then highly idealized and appears to offer a real solution to the separation of the churches.

⁸³⁸ The spelling of Greek words and their translations are dreadfully inaccurate. I attempt to spell them in their correct Greek spellings.

subsequent events that transpired.⁸³⁹ Prior to their departure, even though there was some hesitation as to what the outcome of the Council might be, the general feeling was not forgotten. In fact Scholarios recalls with bitterness, “but we had all, certainly, drunk a sleeping pill, so we closed the eyes of the soul to all healthy reasoning and signs from God, and soon after fell on our own volition in Latin disagreement”, a reflection that is follows the negative events after 1445.⁸⁴⁰

The question of how to define the period marking Scholarios’ change in view from pro-Union to anti-Union is a problem for many scholars in this area of research, illustrated in recent studies by Blanchet, which argue the change in opinion from Union to anti-Union, eventuated in the militaristic disaster of Battle of Varna in 1444. However, this is not creditable in viewing Scholarios’ constant hesitancy to the anti-Union Cause and his adamant pro-Unionism during the period from 1441, after the Council and up to Battle of Varna in 1444. It is reflective in viewing the consequences of Scholarios’ rise from secretary to a position as general judge to the Emperor and his constant endeavour to obtain a position he considers appropriate for himself within the imperial bureaucracy as well as to the West, does raise the question of his change of view and when it had originally taken place.

The policy of requesting military aid from the West seems to be the norm for the Imperial Authority, but the reason for this policy can only be found in the driest moments of its political history.⁸⁴¹ The political policies with the West that are pursued by John VIII Palaiologos are re-enactments of previous policies regarding military aid

⁸³⁹ The remarks annotating Scholarios's acquiescence to the Emperor's desire for an economy-based decision to Union precede conscious acknowledgement of the necessity of military and fiscal aid, certainly this preoccupation about the need for aid was paramount in the political interest of the Byzantines.

⁸⁴⁰ Scholarios, ‘Antilatin Polemic-Letter to Demetrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence (1450)’, vol. III. 117.

⁸⁴¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 209, 253, 296, 318.

that had one basic component, in order to confront the Ottoman Turks who had but all encircled the Imperial City by 1430. This was an incentive to convene the Council. Prior to the Council, when the Byzantines arrived in Venice at the beginning of May 1438, they received the news that Sultan Murad II's Turks were to lay siege to Constantinople. The siege was avoided only by the persuasion of Halil Pasa, motivated by his own economic and political interests with the Byzantines and Latins.⁸⁴² This information about the events in this period gives a more urgent motivation to the foreign policies of Emperor John VIII.

“Its opinion on the proposed Union is partly influenced by its proper situation: from the moment he began to play an official role, it is more or less required to align with the policy defined by the Emperor”⁸⁴³ In this statement it is clear Scholarios exhibited political ambitions, by obsequiously adhering strictly to the policies that the Imperial Authority is demanding. It indicates Scholarios' determination to seek employment elsewhere in the Western domains, as his correspondence number vii demonstrates. It seems that at this point Scholarios was indifferent to any political or theological issue. Since Scholarios is particularly seeking service with Roman Curia, this would override any predilection on the part of Scholarios for any specific political policy or theological question relating to the either side be that East or West. His motivation must have been governed by political ambition and fiscal compensation rather than any adherence to political/theological ideology. Having obtained what he personally desired – advancement and fiscal benefits - Scholarios would endorse the opinions of those to whom he was in service. It is a key component that must not be forgotten in the deliberations on the reason for Scholarios' changed opinion on Union.

⁸⁴² Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 203; Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 378.

⁸⁴³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 281.

On the eve of the Council, Scholarios gives up on his *expatriation projects*. This was probably without great regret, since he had realised his desire for an appropriate position, but this position had particular conditions that required from Scholarios absolute compliance with the desires of the Emperor. We must ask therefore, whether when Scholarios is seeking a position in the service of others, in the Papal Curia or Latin secular circles, was the same theological compliancy not needed as at the Imperial court?

Scholarios' acquiescence reflects his defence of the Unionist policy of John VIII, as can be seen in Scholarios' preparatory Council speech of advice, called a "speech of Council" (λόγος συμβουλευτικός). It presents two ways to the Union: either the Council engages in real theological discussions with the Latins, and the decisions of faith taken after debates are accepted by all, which corresponds to a true Union, or they just agree to conclude "a Union by economy" (οικονομικὴν ἔνωσιν).⁸⁴⁴ This observation made by Scholarios sometime before the date of departure for Italy predicts the objective of this Council, for the reference to the 'economy' could only emphasize the political and military compensation they were hoping to receive from the Latins as a result of the Union of the Churches.

7.5 Scholarios' Direction to Union: Defence of the Patria

Scholarios' statement, attributed to Syropoulos' review of the minutes of the Council of Florence, relates to the need that he articulated for the Union of the Churches, even though the clause that divided them was emphasized.⁸⁴⁵ Ultimately, this clause was laid

⁸⁴⁴ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 602; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 310.

⁸⁴⁵ Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 258.

aside to address the greater need for church unity. Scholarios' desire for Union was certainly consistent with the original purpose of the Council. Nonetheless, his acquiescence to the acceptance of the Filioque Clause resulted from the demands and pressure on the entourage from the Emperor, who was seeking assistance to combat the growing threat of the Ottoman Turks. Hence, the decision to support Union was one based on political necessity rather than religious commitment. There was nearly unanimous consensus, with only a few exceptions on the part of the Byzantines, and Scholarios was part of that decision.⁸⁴⁶ Hence, the crucial component of Scholarios' opinion of the Union lies only in his acquiescence to the dictates of imperial policies rather than with reference to his personal aspirations.⁸⁴⁷

This reflects one constant aspect, parallel to all the religious discussions of Union: the calling for military assistance. Barely having started the proceedings of the Council, the Byzantines were confronted with the news of the impending siege of Constantinople in 1438, and having "a written statement arrive from the City that demanded immediate assistance for the City to the Emperor and the Patriarch".⁸⁴⁸ This constant reminder of the need to come to the assistance of the City was emphatically emphasized at every moment, and was ever-present in the discussions at the Council, "To the Emperor and Patriarch for the diligence of assistance for the care towards the City (Constantinople)."⁸⁴⁹ It is clear that the demand for political assistance was paramount, as reflected in the correspondence to the Emperor and Patriarch. A lengthy letter entitled, 'For *Peace and Help for the Fatherland*, (τῇ Πατρίδι)' shows how this dominated imperial political thought, and Scholarios would be well aware of this aspiration. The

⁸⁴⁶ Gill, *Church Union*, 531; Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 225, 255-269.

⁸⁴⁷ Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 259. Scholarios, 'Agreement of the Eastern and Western Fathers', vol II, 405-407; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 104.

⁸⁴⁸ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 274.

⁸⁴⁹ Ibid.

particular topic of help was emphasized seven times by the Emperor in the deliberations of the Council.⁸⁵⁰

This constant request by the Emperor during discussions on certain dogmatic differences between the churches is demonstrated in the passage of the '*Mémoires*' above and Creighton's edition of Syropoulos' minutes that the discussions must be centred around the needs of "Ἡ Πατρίδα" (The Fatherland). The remarks are suggestive of the possible influence of the Byzantines at the Council. Creighton states the benefits of Union, re-emphasising "For the assistance to the country (City of Constantinople) and for the good the future that Union will bring."⁸⁵¹ In summary, Union at any cost will benefit the political and military necessities of the City of Constantinople.⁸⁵²

Scholarios' correspondence seeking help for Constantinople is primarily addressed in a demand for military assistance by the Latins for Constantinople as one of the requirements for attaining Union between the churches.⁸⁵³ It emphatically evokes the military necessity for aid for Constantinople.⁸⁵⁴ It is in accordance with the imperial desire, which is emphasized by the Emperor in his request to the Pope, for the assistance of the city to which he (the Pope) responds "I will help the City in its demands in the hope that it will facilitate the unity of churches."⁸⁵⁵ It is obvious from the above quote "for help of the City" and "for Union of Churches", that "assistance must be accomplished as quickly as possible".

⁸⁵⁰ Scholarios, 'On the Need to Rescue Constantinople', vol. I. 296.

⁸⁵¹ Syropoulos, *Vera Historia Unionis Non Verae*, 206, 272; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 272–274.

⁸⁵² Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 274: "The Emperor said many things about this to the cardinals and they repeated all to the Pope. That we have agreed to all that has been done in Italy to fulfil the needs for Constantinople, send ships towards her for help; then the Pope obtained four ships of which three were sent for the assistance of the City."

⁸⁵³ Ibid. 296.

⁸⁵⁴ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 359.

⁸⁵⁵ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*. 276.

It is clear Scholarios is involved in the deliberations and final decision of the vote that is perceived under the canopy of economy.⁸⁵⁶ Scholarios articulates the involvement of the Emperor on the matter of state, writing the Emperor had an extensive degree of involvement not only in matters of state (secular), but also “in matters of ecclesiastical administration found in the ideological expression in the concept that the ruler was a quasi-priest.”⁸⁵⁷

In the analysis of the prior meetings of the Council, the text is attributed by the Greek Acts to Scholarios, which was proposed to have been delivered before the Greek Synod Saturday, May 30, 1439 to bring into being a statement on the Union. Although having taken place prior to the official vote, it demonstrates the level of intimidation prior to the decision in the last moments of the vote by the Byzantines.⁸⁵⁸ Although there is some dispute to the exact date, the final decision of acceptance is placed on the Thursday after Pentecost Sunday in the chamber rooms of the Patriarch and the final vote, according to Syropoulos, took place 2 June 1439.⁸⁵⁹ The final image is Scholarios’ voluntary acquiescence to Union.

⁸⁵⁶ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.330. Like other members of the Byzantine delegation, Scholarios gave a “notice” or “voting” on the Filioque and the Union; however, it is well known that all archons and other laymen present in Florence were interviewed by the Emperor and had to state their opinion, which was without exception in favour of Union. Therefore, it is indisputable that Scholarios approved the Union, as did all his companions. Syropoulos indicates this session was 2 June 1439, after the Patriarch and the metropolitans themselves, were in the majority declaring the recognition of the validity of the Latin Filioque, and while the hegumens and patriarchal officers were, for their part, excluded from the vote.

⁸⁵⁷ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*.357. The above statement emphasizes the formidable influence of the Emperor in this matter of Union. Even though there is a discrepancy in the versions, the presence of Scholarios in deliberations for the Union is evident, but also the application of the Union in adhering to a formula, which would be comparable to approving the Filioque Clause.

⁸⁵⁸ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.330.

⁸⁵⁹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*.483–485; Gill, *Council of Florence*.256–257. See footnote on the difference of dates; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.330.

7.6 Critique of the Departure

The early departure of Scholarios, with Despot Dimitrios and Plethon, may imply opposition to the decrees of the Council.⁸⁶⁰ However, there is some disagreement about the significance of this departure: Scholarios did not at any point articulate his dissatisfaction until five years later and only then was there any decision forthcoming. The desire to avoid pronouncing any opposition was achieved, as being a layman it was not necessary to specify to which category he belonged. In any event, Scholarios left Florence in advance of any legality, because it was not necessary for laymen to vote on the Council Decrees, or remain for the final Liturgy to sanction the Union of Churches.

However, Scholarios' early departure can be examined in the context of direct instructions and admonition by the Emperor, due to the need to enforce the Emperor's policy of Union before any negative discord could grow in Constantinople. It is a legitimate reason for Scholarios' early departure, particularly with the departure of the Despot Dimitrios, given that the Despot Dimitrios had indicated a negative opinion about the Council. It must be assumed, since Scholarios did depart early, that he had certainly first obtained permission from the Emperor to depart. It is very likely this is

⁸⁶⁰ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.332: After these few interventions, Scholarios prematurely leaves the Council, before even the Union Decree has been drafted. Syropoulos gives political meaning to his departure in the company of Despot Demetrios and Plethon on 25 June 1439: "the despot left for Venice in reconçant to his living expenses, because he did not accept to be present at the signing of the Decree, nor at the Union. With him went also very learned professors Gemistos and Scholarios, who wished not to be present". In several of his correspondences after the Council, Scholarios recalls this departure and the support of a protest meaning. Thus, in his letter to the Despot Demetrios around 1450, he focuses on the resistance, which would have corresponded throughout the Council and endorsed in retrospect his fight, by mentioning twice their common journey to Venice some time before the Union Decree was signed. However, in one of his first polemical writings, the first Treaty on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, dated only 1445, Scholarios writes much more soberly that he went to Venice before the end of the Council, with many other Byzantines, some because they were discontented with the city, while the others were motivated by the refusal to attend the conclusion of the Union.

the reason for his early departure—not, as it is sometimes asserted, as a clear manifestation of disapproval of the Union.⁸⁶¹

Recent studies maintain Scholarios' involvement in the Council was limited. This conclusion is drawn from the testimony of Syropoulos, but it does appear questionable. The suggestion is that Scholarios is manifesting the proposal of a formula of conciliation in Ferrara regarding the Filioque, which is dated at the end of April 1439 in Florence. However, information in the Greek Acts is equally questionable regarding the sequence of events, which leaves room to enquire about the validity of this assumption.⁸⁶² Gill is very informative in the precision of the proceedings of the Council. It is obvious that the information presented by either by Syropoulos or by Scholarios could be taken as authentic, not that they were contradicting each other, but the recollections of the events could be affected by some personal bias.⁸⁶³

The extract from Scholarios writings, '*On the need for relief or rescue of Constantinople*' is crucial in the argument of my thesis, for it illustrates the political urgency, and, I suggest, it galvanises the reason for the Council. However, there are some discrepancies as to its authenticity, given in the explanatory note on this issue. Blanchet queries its legitimacy by specifying "offending texts" that were altered, included the one just cited; in addition, '*On the nature of religious to conclude, barriers to religious peace, The ways to obtain religious peace*',⁸⁶⁴ the introductory text '*The note of Scholarios in the Assembly of the Eastern,*' and '*Scholarios opinion in*

⁸⁶¹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*.458; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.332.

⁸⁶² Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.332–4.

⁸⁶³ Ibid. 333.

⁸⁶⁴ Scholarios, 'The Ways to Obtain Religious Peace', [Sur le caractère de la paix religieuse à conclure], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 306.

favour of the union'.⁸⁶⁵ Even though it cannot be guaranteed to be authentic, Scholarios' correspondences do illuminate a version of events that had certainly taken place.⁸⁶⁶ The moment of the vote, even though it was as a result of intimidation to some degree, was to be understood as reaching a common agreement for military aid and economic assistance. The implication of what these four speeches were indicating, not only by Scholarios but also by Syropoulos, was the crucial need for assistance or relief for Constantinople.⁸⁶⁷

In light of this observation, it can be agreed that there is legitimacy to the texts stated above. It is evident to all in Florence that the Emperor wants the Union for diplomatic reasons, and for reasons of economy.⁸⁶⁸ The strength of the political and what is described as patriotic argument is certainly not as negligible as Blanchet emphasizes; therefore Scholarios voluntarily supported this policy and accepts even the principle of Union by economy.⁸⁶⁹

The imperative concluding moments are at the end of the Council, during the vote on the Filioque Clause on 2 June 1439, the signing of the Decree on Friday 3 July, and

⁸⁶⁵ Scholarios, 'The Note of Scholarios in the Assembly of the Eastern', [Billet de Scholarios à l'assemblée des Orientaux], vol.I.295–296; Scholarios, 'Scholarios Opinion in Favour of the Union', [Avis de Scholarios en faveur de l'union] vol.I.372–374; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.334. Although all these texts are referred to in four major manuscripts dating from the 15th century, directly or indirectly, all manuscripts depend on a version of the works of Scholarios copied by Plousiadenos.

⁸⁶⁶ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.334. Knowing that it assigns to Scholarios other unionist texts whose authenticity is uncertain, we can look with legitimate suspicion on the various texts that Scholarios is supposed to have written at the time of the Council. The coherence that is discernible between the description of the speech in the notice and the contents of the speeches themselves offers the main evidence for authenticity of these texts (J.Gill, after M.Jugie).

⁸⁶⁷ Ibid. 334.

⁸⁶⁸ Gill, *The Council of Florence*.259.

⁸⁶⁹ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.349–350. Continuing the observation by Blanchet, "In the case of all of the archons laymen, they prepared and perhaps even approved the idea that this concession is necessary, and similarly, a certain number of clerics and monks were convinced by the argument of the economy. However, most of the clergy tend to determine based on their actual religious beliefs. Thus, genuine unionists, such as Bessarion for example, were sincerely satisfied by the existence of an agreed dogmatism between Latin and Greek. They do not betray their own design of orthodoxy by ratifying the Decree, on the contrary, many metropolitans seem to agree only reluctantly and unwillingly to sign the Union, while even the undercut by John VIII's influence certainly weighs on their decision."; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*.415.

Sunday 5 July 1439, in the celebration of the Liturgy of Union, with the Emperor being visibly antagonistic to all who express their disagreement.⁸⁷⁰ The arrival at a final decisive opinion by the Byzantines in these last moments would be seen as acrimonious, and provides the foundation for the reason why Scholarios began to formulate a negative opinion towards Union from this point in time.⁸⁷¹

The acrimoniousness about any decision on Union could be seen as the catalyst to the opposition that was met by those who returned to Constantinople from Florence. Again it is noted that Syropoulos explicitly accuses Metrophanes of Cyzicus of being “left to buy”, referring to the need to appropriate the total acceptance of the Union cause, while he presents Gregory Mammas as unscrupulously involved in intrigues.⁸⁷² In light of this information, Scholarios was sent with some urgency and with the blessing of the Emperor, prior to the final ending of the Council to eliminate any elements remaining in opposition to the Union. These recurring charges from the anti-Unionists in 1440 are therefore not without foundation, and such compromises could feed the resentment and frustration of those who did nothing, even though they had finally signed the Decree.⁸⁷³

The clarifications made by Blanchet build on Syropoulos and Turner’s observations; she is more analytical in her approach, and offers a more distinct and precise account of the course of events in that period, even though at times she seems to be led to the wrong conclusions.⁸⁷⁴

⁸⁷⁰ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*. 406; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*. 349–350.

⁸⁷¹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*. 552–555; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 350.

⁸⁷² Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 351.

⁸⁷³ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*. 552–555; Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Mark of Epheses (1440)’, [A Marc d’Ephèse (1440)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 445; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 355–7.

⁸⁷⁴ Turner, ‘George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence’, 98; Syropoulos, *Mémoires*.482–486; Gill, *Council of Florence*.258–263.

The statistics recorded on the return from Florence in 1440 by John Eugenikos, writing his book entitled, *'The Antirrhétiques, the anti-Union pamphlet'*, offers the crucial insight that all representatives of the Byzantines were criticised and unrestrainedly derided for their cowardice and their complacency towards the Latins.⁸⁷⁵ This criticism indicates the degree of political manoeuvring that was being required for the economic necessity of acquiring military assistance. The above passage is another example of the purpose the Byzantines desired in the convening of the Council.⁸⁷⁶

7.7 Anti-Union Decision

At the request of the future Patriarch, Gregory Mammas, Scholarios composed his *'Refutation of the Syllogisms of Mark, Supplement of Polemic Works'*, 1442, reflecting his oppositional stance on the question of anti-Union, with respect for his teacher and spiritual father, Mark Eugenikos, who was an ardent anti-Unionist.⁸⁷⁷ An examination of both Scholarios' eulogy for Mark Eugenikos, titled *'Éloges funèbres (Funeral Oration for Mark Eugenikos)'*, in 1444 and his *'Refutation'* show a marked difference in his stance on Union.⁸⁷⁸

The question must be asked, "When did Scholarios begin to change his mind concerning Union?" The proposed answer is that it was a gradual process towards the point that he actually admits it, and did not take place at a single given point in time.

When Scholarios wrote to Filelfo, a personal friend and student of Plethon, in the year

⁸⁷⁵ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 356. In the letter that Mark of Ephesus addressed to Scholarios in the second half of 1440, Eugenikos condemned the fickleness of his former pupil about union in a few lines of his response, indicating the particular context in which this letter is being written.

⁸⁷⁶ Ibid. 356.

⁸⁷⁷ Scholarios, 'Response to the Syllogisms of Mark of Ephesus on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Réponse aux syllogismes de Marc d' Ephèse sur la procession du Saint-Esprit], vol.III.476; Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence', 93.

⁸⁷⁸ Scholarios, 'Funerial Eulogies', vol.I.247.

1442, the letter shows him still “enjoying favours at court and was at least officially Unionist”.⁸⁷⁹ But Scholarios already had some hesitancy about the legality of the Union due to the process by which the Union was achieved, which he accentuates in his letter to Mark Eugenikos in 1440, expressing his misgivings about relying on any assistance that could be achieved from the Latins.⁸⁸⁰ Various possible answers have been presented above concerning this question, but it is most likely that the initial reservations towards Union were nascent from the last days of deliberation between 29 May and 5 June 1439.⁸⁸¹

The mere fact that Scholarios is asked to refute the ‘*Syllogisms of Eugenikos*’ and defend the pro-Union stance, is a distinct indication of his attitude towards Unionism, even when he had hesitations regarding its legitimacy, which he acknowledged to Eugenikos immediately on his return from Florence. There is no contradiction in Mark Eugenikos’s consideration of him as indecisive, especially when, a few years later, Scholarios openly justified Eugenikos’s defence of the faith.⁸⁸² What is observable is that Scholarios did not immediately change his views towards Union after his return from Florence but did so a few years later; Syropoulos and Balsamon recanted immediately on their return from Florence, whereas Scholarios did not include himself in this action.

An added point indicating Scholarios’ change of view on the subject of Union can be found in the events Scholarios writes about in his correspondence to Despot Dimitrios

⁸⁷⁹ Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios’, 437.

⁸⁸⁰ Scholarios, ‘Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephesus (1440)’, vol.IV.445–449; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.355.

⁸⁸¹ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*.410–411; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.326–333; Gill, *The Sources of the ACTA of the Council of Florence*. 131–143; Gill, *Council of Florence*, 115–130.

⁸⁸² Scholarios, ‘Response to the Syllogisms of Mark of Ephesus on the Procession of the Holy Spirit’, vol. III. 476.

in 1450,⁸⁸³ primarily the reason behind the coup by the Despot against his brother and Emperor John VIII in 1442, with support of anti-Unionist and the help of Ottoman Turks to seize the throne. This event cannot have been separate, and was initiated by the Ottoman Turks' actions in 1440 and 1441 in their conquest of northern Serbia and their invasion of Transylvania.⁸⁸⁴ It is relevant that the Ottoman Turks, assisting in the coup, demonstrated an outright Turkish opposition to the Union.⁸⁸⁵ It can be assumed that his initial change on the subject of Union probably started to occur between 1441 and 1442, after Gregory Mammas had asked Scholarios to write his refutation, and before the death of Mark Eugenikos in 1444.⁸⁸⁶

Scholarios did not openly demonstrate any affinity with the cause of anti-Unionism in this period, because of his continuous propagating and defending of the policies of the Imperial Authority. In addition the Emperor would have made any anti-unionist expression an act of sedition, since the Emperor had his brother, Dimitrios, who the anti-Unionist looked on Dimitrios as protector and restorer of Orthodoxy, held under house arrest for the failed coup. Therefore, Scholarios initial change in view must have taken place between 1442 and 1444.

The words and expressions used by Scholarios in the eulogy for Eugenikos indicates he had changed towards the position held by Eugenikos, now supporting the anti-Union cause by the year of Mark's death. In earlier correspondence, from 1442, when confronted by Eugenikos on his wavering on the problem of the Filioque Clause,

⁸⁸³ Scholarios, 'Antilatin Polemic-Letter to Dimitrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence, vol. III. 119.

⁸⁸⁴ Franz Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time*. Bollingen Series, 96. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), 11-63.

⁸⁸⁵ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 360-361

⁸⁸⁶ Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*. 43.

Scholarios rebutted him by defending the Union.⁸⁸⁷ Mark Eugenikos was imprisoned by the Byzantine authorities after his return from Florence. Scholarios alludes to this imprisonment in his eulogy of Eugenikos, and asserts this is evidence of Eugenikos's theological conviction.

Neither this, nor the implications following the events of the coup by Despot Dimitrios, nor the incursions by the Ottoman Turks, should be overlooked.⁸⁸⁸ These examples only support what has been stated above concerning the accusation of sedition and reinforce the argument that Scholarios' dedication to the Emperor was governed by the systematic execution of the imperial ideology and the political endorsement of the Emperor's public image in general, and primarily motivated by Scholarios own ambitions.⁸⁸⁹

There is another aspect of the Eugenikos eulogy that reveals more information about Scholarios' change of position, as reflected by the use of his title. The title on the heading of the eulogy refers to Scholarios as Gennadios instead of his secular name George. In this case, the eulogy must have been written when Scholarios became a monk after 1450, since this name was used only after that year. The title affirms the position of Scholarios as a monastic and therefore suggests he would be likely to express an anti-union stance. The argument supporting this contention is that certain correspondence of Scholarios, especially leading up to and after the fall of Constantinople, is tainted with anti-Unionism, not only due to the theological dispute pertaining to Union of the Churches, but also because of the hostility of the Turks

⁸⁸⁷ Scholarios, 'Response to the Syllogisms of Mark of Ephesus on the Procession of the Holy Spirit', [Réponse aux syllogismes de Marc d'Ephèse sur la procession du Saint Esprit] vol.III.476.

⁸⁸⁸ Scholarios, 'Funeral Eulogies-Eulogy of Mark Eugenikos, Archbishop of Ephesus', [Éloge de Marc Eugenikos, archevêque d'Ephèse], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), vol I. 251; Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, 43.

⁸⁸⁹ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 60.

towards this Union. The Ottoman Turks by this period had all but surrounded the City of Constantinople.⁸⁹⁰

Scholarios' eulogy of Eugenikos would suggest his change of opinion to anti-Unionism happened at the time of Mark's death. Although the eulogy was given in 1444, elements were written or re-written after 1453, when the Ottoman Turks had subjugated the City. Thus, it might be assumed the eulogy of Eugenikos was adjusted to fit the political-theological ideology of the period. If this eulogy of Eugenikos supports this argument it presents a problem, especially for those arguing in favour of the authenticity of the eulogy having been written and delivered at the moment of Mark's death in 1444, or reflecting the exact moment when Scholarios' change in opinion of Union occurred.

All correspondence and letters of Scholarios for and against Union mentioned in the thesis, together with the '*Refutation of the Syllogism of Mark Eugenikos*', show him leaning towards a certain political persuasion after 1444. However, even though the correspondence might be politically motivated, it does allow some possible insight into the reason for, and the time of, Scholarios' change. The failed crusade of Varna by the Latins in November 1444 can be considered as the turning point in Scholarios' change of position.

In fact, no one in Constantinople considers the Union of Florence as a satisfactory agreement—evidenced by the reluctance of the Emperor John VIII himself to officially

⁸⁹⁰ Scholarios, 'Sermon and Panegyric-Sermon for the Feast of the Presentation', [Sermon pour la fête de la Présentation], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.I.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1928), 161, 172; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 220; Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his time*.64-128; Runciman, *Fall of Constantinople*.50-60; Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*.71; Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant*, vol.ii.108-137; Nicol, *Immortal Emperor*.54-73; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*.352; Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*.553.

endorse the Florentine order and make it an act of State.⁸⁹¹ It was only to be realised by his brother Emperor Constantine XI, who finally accomplished an obsolete endorsement of the Florentine order of Union in 1452.⁸⁹²

In Scholarios' address to Mark Eugenikos in 1440, his personal position is justified by reference to the political situation, as he concedes he was Unionist by economy and out of necessity, while acknowledging he understands the objective of the dogmatic truth.⁸⁹³ Scholarios carefully explains his collaboration is only provisional, whilst he insists on the details that proscribe the Union.⁸⁹⁴ The ambiguity of his position suggests he aspires to be politically correct on this issue. Turner argues that Scholarios was in agreement with the political changes that were motivated, not by the political events of the Byzantine, Latin and Ottoman activities, but by the cultural advances that his research was uncovering in this period of political tumult.⁸⁹⁵

Scholarios' perspective on the question of Union was on two levels: not merely pragmatic, co-operating in assisting the Unionist policy of John VIII due to imperial political and official endorsement, but rather hoping that the Union could benefit the Empire, while at the same time disapproving of the method of political manoeuvring in acquiescence to the theological questions.⁸⁹⁶ Scholarios' indecisiveness is in relation to

⁸⁹¹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 378.

⁸⁹² Gill, *The Council of Florence*.266-267; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.367–368; Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*.359. However, at the beginning of the 1440s, the political gain first promised the Empire's reconciliation with Rome, outweighed all other considerations, and Emperor John VIII suppressed all opposition. In May 1440, he endorsed the election of the Unionist Patriarch in the person of Metrophanes and constrains clergy who denounce the edicts of the Council of Florence from openly expressing their opposition in all official institutions. The alliance between political and religious of the Byzantine State bodies continued, even if the guidelines followed appear at best as a temporarily compromise for reasons of State.

⁸⁹³ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephesus (1440)', vol.IV.445.

⁸⁹⁴ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 368

⁸⁹⁵ Nikolaos V. Tomadaki, *According to the Fall of Constantinople (1453)*. (Thessaloniki: Pournara, 1993), 79,116-117. Turner, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarios', 431; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 369.

⁸⁹⁶ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*.63; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.353.

the political situation; it can be only due to the political scenario developing from 1441 and subsequently through 1443 and 1444.

Cultural or theological questions were not uppermost in Scholarios' attitude towards the political situation, which would indicate that Scholarios was pragmatic about the reality he faced; any philosophical or theological thoughts were influenced by this practical perspective. The use and function of discourse were always in the interests of the Imperial Authority,⁸⁹⁷ and this confirms remarks in Mark Eugenikos' correspondence with Scholarios, that his religious views would be interpreted as pertaining to the political situation that governed the selection of his point of view, whether theological or political.

The disappointing reality of the Union signed at Florence certainly was not the turning point of Scholarios' change in view but may have been the seed of the subsequent change.⁸⁹⁸ As it is further elucidates, as Scholarios continues his research, reading and personal studies of the Latin fathers, he remained "persuaded first that the Union is possible, a Union that would be based on a rigorous demonstration of consensus patrum; the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was the only notable difference to his eyes between the Roman and Orthodox Christians."⁸⁹⁹

Scholarios was still advocating pro-Union propensities in 1444, suggesting he was still optimistic about the the outcome of the Union, in obtaining military aid. Scholarios continues to lead the life of the court and maintain close relationships with various Latins, as verified by the letter he receives from one of his Italian friends, Ciriaco of

⁸⁹⁷ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 61.

⁸⁹⁸ Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Ambroise Traversari', [A Ambroise Traversari (1438)], in *Œuvres complètes de Gennadios Scholarios*, vol.IV.eds. Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xénophon Siderides, (Paris: Maison De La Bonne Presse, 1935), 440; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.369; Gill, *The Council of Florence*, 270.

⁸⁹⁹ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 369.

Ancona, in 1444. What is interesting in this letter is that the writer was in Pera in June and July 1444 during the preparations for the Crusade of Varna and had the opportunity to meet Scholarios during his stay. Later, in Imbros on 29 September 1444, Ciriaco wrote a letter filled with references, in which he recounts his journey since leaving the Byzantine capital.⁹⁰⁰

The information above indicates Scholarios perceived the events that had tremendous impact on the hopes of the Byzantines, particularly those in Constantinople. Even up to the year 1444, the year of Mark's death on the 23 June, and during the period of Ciriaco's time in Constantinople and prior to the devastating circumstances of the Crusade of Varna, Scholarios still had hope.⁹⁰¹ In fact, his letters and sermons, particularly after the events, recall the wars and difficulties of this period.

Later Theodore Gazis' (Θεόδωρος Γαζής) 'would recall the analysis emphasizes in the situation of the political and theological tumultuous events leading up to the eventual seizure of city of Constantinople "the preoccupation of the insidious occupation in religious disputes and in the religious controversies by the Latins and Constantinopolitans, Ottomans were capturing their few remaining cities and enslaving their wives and children."⁹⁰²

This information does throw further light on the lengthy period of indecisiveness Scholarios experienced about the question of the Union, since the years of 1442–1444 can be seen as to be the decisive years in the collapse and eventual seizure of the City of

⁹⁰⁰ Cyriac of Ancona, *Later Travels*, ed. and trans. Edward W. Bodnar, (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003), 94-95; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 372.

⁹⁰¹ Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, 222.

⁹⁰² Deno John Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissance and the Byzantine and Roman Churches*. (Madison Wisconsin: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1989). 73; Scholarios, 'Sermon and Panegyric-Sermon for the Feast of the Presentation', vol. I. 171; Scholarios, Letter to Dimitrios Palaiologos against the Union of Florence'; vol. III. 117.

Constantinople.⁹⁰³ The 'economy' cited by Scholarios here probably affects everything about the Byzantine Empire military defence projects: “[we] may indeed speculate that before the battle of Varna, and official support displayed by senior Byzantines to the anti-Union movement would have been unwelcome, while after the defeat, from November 1444, the issue was no longer the same.”⁹⁰⁴ Both Blanchet and Turner, suggest that the decisive moment of Scholarios’ final disclosure of his stance towards Union was the Battle of Varna.⁹⁰⁵ In particular, Scholarios’ massive anti-Latin polemic work written in 1445, would give support to this argument.⁹⁰⁶ However, I disagree with this assumption.

It would seem too convenient that Varna was the catalyst for Scholarios’ decision to change. However, the events in the period prior to 1442 and after were formative in his realization of the fallacy of “economy”. Anyone would have realized—especially a politically astute individual such as Scholarios, having been nurtured in his earlier years in this field of imperial politics—the political consequences of the recent events of the Ottomans Turks, particularly in 1441.⁹⁰⁷ Particularly also in 1442 when the Ottoman Turks were supporting the Despot Dimitrios in a unsuccessful coup against his brother Emperor John VIII with whom the Byzantines had to align, it became clear it was not with the Latins but with the Ottoman Turks they needed to engage in dialogue.

⁹⁰³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.372–3; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins*, 220.

⁹⁰⁴ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 374, 381.

⁹⁰⁵ Turner, ‘George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence’, 95.

⁹⁰⁶ Turner, ‘The Career of George-Gennadius scholarios’, 431.

⁹⁰⁷ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*.361–2; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*.373.

The Imperial Authority, particularly the emperor, was also aware of the political situation in Europe.⁹⁰⁸ Scholarios' attitude to the Union of Florence did initially depend on the will of John VIII, and only after his death in 1447, and with the growing dominance of the Ottomans, did Scholarios see the need to be diplomatic, in the sense of seeing both sides, to remain politically adroit. The reason for Scholarios' indecisiveness may indeed be evidence of his political astuteness, in his recognition of the reality of the political situation.⁹⁰⁹

It was evident from the economic struggles the Byzantines were facing in this period of political insecurity that they would have to conclude a truce with the Ottomans, to thaw the hostility between them, in order to procrastinate and to camouflage their real intentions of preparing arms against the Ottomans.⁹¹⁰ Even though attempts have been made to find an exact date on which Scholarios' change in view happened, this is very speculative. C.J.G. Turner identifies four factors relevant in thinking about the motivation for Scholarios' change, listing them as personal, psychological, political and theological. However, patriotic reasons should also be added to this list. If this includes the political motivations discussed in this thesis then this list seems correct.⁹¹¹

The evolution of Scholarios' theological thinking as a radical conversion has been discussed in terms of a gradual change in perception, in keeping with the political

⁹⁰⁸ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 381; Colin Imber, *The Crusade of Varna, 1443-5*. (Aldershot; Ashgate 2006), 14-15. See to the reason of the preparations of the Varna Crusade in the political manoeuvring, especially when, the Byzantine ambassador Theodore Karystinos enthusiasm on the news of the crusade, particularly after Pope Eugenius IV issuing the crusading Bull on New Year's Day 1443.

⁹⁰⁹ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*. 361. For example; the Ottoman Turks' invasion of Serbia and Transylvania in 1441 was the catalyst for the Crusade of Varna, 1444: Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios* .378.

⁹¹⁰ Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, 382-3; Necipoğlu, *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins* .220-221; Mark C. Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204-1453. Middle Ages Series*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 120.

⁹¹¹ Turner, 'George-Gennadius Scholarios and the Union of Florence', 96; Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 378.

problems that beset the Byzantine state. As I have asserted, Scholarios was not initially engaged in theological studies but in the studies of philosophy, or more correctly the discipline of rhetorical studies. Scholarios' studies in the Aristotelian philosophies did not make him a devoted acolyte of this philosophy, nevertheless he used it as a guide for articulation and clarification, and to better understand the concepts of theology.⁹¹² The evolution of his theology was conditional on his coming to terms with the reality of the political consequences. It is understandable that Scholarios started to write his major theological treatises mostly in the period of his noticeable change to anti-Union.

If so, then the theological treatises were not undertaken for strictly theological reasons, but were part of a political agenda imposed by the political situation that the Emperor, Constantinople and Scholarios found themselves in. Scholarios would use his comprehensive studies of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas together with other Western Church Fathers, not to combat the errors of the Roman Church on the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, but to show a sceptical political stance in relation to his original commitment for the rapprochement with Rome against a common foe⁹¹³, but this would lose its impetus at the moment of political realization.⁹¹⁴

Scholarios was advocating pro-Union views, and demonstrating optimism about the the outcome of the Union, in terms of obtaining military aid. He continued to lead the life of the court and maintain close relationships with various Latins, corresponding with them. The mere fact that Scholarios is communicating and associating with Ciriaco of Ancona in Pera in June and July 1444 during the preparations for the Crusade of Varna

⁹¹² Scholarios, 'Signed Letters-To Mark of Ephesus (1440)', vol.IV.446

⁹¹³ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 380.

⁹¹⁴ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 361–373.

and afterwards up to the event of the Battle of Varna in November of the same year, suggests Scholarios has retained his unremitting optimism in the union.⁹¹⁵

Scholarios' transformation to anti-Unionism, therefore, was neither sudden nor absolute; rather it came about as a choice reflected and influenced by the circumstances.⁹¹⁶ The political motivation that has been asserted in this thesis as the reason for Scholarios' change in view was shaped by his realization of the events unfolding. Scholarios himself asserted that the comprehensive progress of reviewing his opinions regarding the issue of Union was personal, as he had professed to Mark Eugenikos in his letter of 1440 after his return from Florence.

In this chapter, we have seen how the complex relations of the cultural, economic and political events and influences shaped the conditions that caused the Council to be convoked. I have argued that the Council was being utilized by the Byzantines as a political expediency that the Latins were aware of, since the Latins constantly demanded from the Byzantines a doctrinal clarification in accordance with the Roman Church as prerequisite to any political advantage or assistance. From the start of his studies Scholarios was encouraged to take up the political identity of the state, and so advocated the policies that were directed by the Emperor and the imperial authority. His change from a pro-Union to an anti-Union stance can be explained by his gradual realisation of the political reality of the time. I have argued that Scholarios' apparent indecision in respect of Union can be accounted for by his acquiescence to the directives of imperial authority, and most importantly, by his own political aspirations. His final choice was determined by the on-going events and the full realization of the circumstances that these events were dictating.

⁹¹⁵ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 372.

⁹¹⁶ Angelov, *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought*, 60–61, 98, 105.

CHAPTER EIGHT - CONCLUSION

Scholarios' initial studies in his earlier years were primarily to nurture his administrative identity and to facilitate his effectiveness in political dialogue. This claim is borne out by his actions at the Council of Florence. In contrast to his pro-Union advocacy, Scholarios's anti-Union work on the Procession of the Holy Spirit written in 1446 openly attacks the Roman Church; however, Scholarios remained an ardent Thomist, for this does not imply any lesser esteem for Aquinas' value. One may ask whether his ~~apologia~~ ^{apologia} for Orthodoxy is a camouflage for his pro-Latin sympathies. Upon closer examination of Scholarios's attraction to Thomistic theology and erudition, which was so intricately aligned with the Roman Church, one could conclude that Scholarios's interest might have been motivated not primarily to defend Orthodoxy, but to bring Orthodox theology into line with that of the Roman Church for political purposes, as long as it was pertinent. It reaffirms also what had been outlined above - that Scholarios's reflections on the disciplines of philosophy and theology are not primarily in the interest of these disciplines, but the political objective of what the Union will bring.

This is evident on page 27 of '*Vera historia unionis non verae*', where the work of the Council is said to be aimed at bringing about Union. It is stated that; "This work of union is holy and desired and we desire the same ..." ⁹¹⁷ The manner in which these words are used in that sentence is indicative of the desire for union at any cost. The presentation of the formulas of the Procession of the Holy Spirit at the Council of Florence by Scholarios is motivated by this desire. It is evident that union was desired

⁹¹⁷ Syropoulos, *Vera Historia Unionis Non Verae*, 27.

on both sides, but the difference in opinion as to how that union was to be accomplished is not made explicit, but instead is camouflaged by the intricacies of political intrigue.⁹¹⁸

Thomas Aquinas's main aim in his works was to edify and instruct all in the dogmas of the Roman Church. Three works of Aquinas, '*De veritate catholicae fidei contra gentiles*' or '*Summa contra gentiles*' and '*Summa theologiae*', plus '*Contra errors graecorum*', reflect his aims. The topic that is most relevant to the Latins and the Byzantines is Trinitarian dogma, especially the Filioque Clause, which is defined in '*Summa theologiae*', but the work '*Summa contra gentiles*' also has the major motive of the conversion of the Mohammedans and Orthodox Christians.⁹¹⁹ The correlation between Thomas Aquinas's works and their subsequent translations into Greek by Kydonis and later use by Scholarios is indicative of their motivation. Glycofrydi-Leontsini summarizes by stating that the Kydonis translation gave fruitful contacts between Latin West and Greek East. Scholarios's work sets out the theological argumentation between the Roman Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church within this realm of philosophical and theological speculations.

Scholarios correspondences also suggest an overwhelming emphasis on the political agenda, with correspondingly less attention to the theological and less so to the philosophical issues. When there was any theological subject matter, it became apparent only after the year 1444. Scholarios' transition from pro-Union to anti-Union is not made because of any theological or philosophical conviction *per se*, but is an adaptation to the social/political circumstances he found himself facing.

⁹¹⁸ Syropoulos, *Mémoires*, 48. .

⁹¹⁹ Vose, *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews*, 53–56; Schein, *Fideles Crucis*, 72–112.

Summary of the thesis findings: How does each chapter contribute to the conclusion?

In Chapter One, I considered the argument that Scholarios's identity was actually a composite of different individuals. I offered a critical assessment of this argument, as this hypothesis has been used by some critics to explain the apparent change or contradiction in views from pro to anti-Union (in that different individuals were actually responsible for expressing the different views). I found more evidence to support the view that he was indeed one person. The rest of the thesis proceeds with this premise. The thesis task was therefore to explain his change of position as one single individual, and to examine the reason for this.

In Chapter Two I set out the principal parameters of the thesis and the question to be investigated, and include a short biography of Scholarios. This chapter indicated the key sources to be used in responding to the question about his change of stance. It also explained my methodology, which was go back through Scholarios' own texts and the available sources we have about him, to undertake a close textual analysis of any evidence for his motivations and reasons for his views.

In the third chapter of the thesis I explored Scholarios' background in philosophy, and established that the study of philosophy was implicitly part of a political agenda to support the furtherance of the imperial Byzantine state. Hence, Scholarios' studies in philosophical logic, methodology, rhetoric, and panegyric works were part of a strategic approach on the part of the state to enable diplomats and representatives to dispute successfully with their Latin counterparts. This chapter supports the contention that there was a political dimension to Scholarios' intellectual biography and the formation of his views.

In the fourth chapter I explored Scholarios' background in theology, arguing that Scholarios' study of theology of Eastern and Western Fathers, including St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas, was also shot through with elements of political necessity. A defence of Orthodox Christian doctrine which sought to find a commonality between the Eastern and Western Churches would be motivated to some degree by arguments for unification, which would have political repercussions that extended beyond abstract theological concerns. This chapter further supports the argument about Scholarios' political dimensions and motivations.

In Chapter 5 I examined Scholarios' relationship with George Gemistos Plethon. I focussed on the significance of their disagreements about fundamental philosophical systems and key foundations of thought; namely Aristotelianism versus Platonism. My aim was to demonstrate that the confrontation between these two individuals symbolises not just a commitment to two different philosophies, but that both would be well aware of the respective political implications of the philosophies they were defending, in particular in relation to the future of the Byzantine State. The subject matter of Christian *oikonomia* that Scholarios defends, contrasts markedly with Plethon's vision of a Hellenistic/secular state. This fundamental difference helps to support the contention that Scholarios has some clear views about political and practical matters, even if these have to be realised and articulated through other means and in other contexts.

Sixth chapter: If the findings of the above chapters were correct, and there was a political interest in Scholarios' studies of philosophical and theological subjects, then it will follow that any communication and contact between Byzantium and the West

(whether with Papal or secular powers) would manifest elements of this political interest. Hence this chapter aims to clarify the reason for Scholarios' change of view from pro-Union to anti-Union in the context of key historical events at the time. This chapter provides evidence from the historical circumstances of the Byzantine state to support this contention.

Chapter Seven: All the above chapters have looked at the hypothesis that there were underlying political motivations and circumstances surrounding Scholarios' character and actions. I have argued it would be difficult to ignore the urgency of key historical events which had occurred both before and during the period in question, when Scholarios changed his mind. I suggest it was not just one political event (the battle of Varna) that caused him to shift position, but that a complex combination of his individual intellectual biography, the background of his formative studies in theology, his experiences at court, the increasing political dominance of the Ottoman Turks, and his disagreements with Plethon about the best future interest of the state, were all contributory factors in his change of stance from pro to anti-Union. The final catalyst was the convening of the Council at Florence and the subsequent expansion of the Turks' political power. Thus I argue that there was always implicitly a political dimension to Scholarios' thinking, but that his change of position is the culmination or most obvious manifestation of his political concerns. Hence I conclude that the reason for his change of position was in fact political.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Abe, Horst Rudolf. *Die Soziale Gliederung der Erfurter Studentenschaft im Mittelalter 1392-1521*. (The social structure of the Erfurt student body in the middle ages 1392-1521). In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Erfurt (1392-1816)* (2nd ed.). (The Contributions to the History of the University of Erfurt (1392-1816) (2nd ed.). Issued by *Horst Rudolph Abe Herausgegeben vom Rektor der Medizinischen Akademie, Egbert Schwarz*, 1-138. (Horst Rudolph Abe the Rector of the Medical Academy, edited by Egbert Schwarz). Erfurt, Germany: Rektor der Medizinischen Akademie Erfurt, 1962.

Akindynos, Gregorios. *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*. Greek Text and English Translation by Angela Constantinides Hero. *Dumbarton Oaks Texts*, 7. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, Research Library and Collection, 1983. Journal degrees Academics Gymnasii Patavini Journal degrees Academics Gymnasii Patavini.

Apostolopoulou, Machi Paizi. 'Appealing to the Authority of a Learned Patriarch: new evidence on Gennadios Scholarios Responses to the Questions of George Brankovic.' *The Historical Review (La Revue Historique)* 9 (2012): 95-116.

Cabasilas, Nicholas. *The Life in Christ*. New York: Athens Printing Company, 1974.

Chomatenos, Demetrios. *Ἐντάλματα Διδόμενα Τοῖς Χειροτονουμένοις μητροπολίταις, καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόποις, καὶ ἐτέροις.* (Mandate for Ordained Metropolitan and Archbishop and others). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 119: 1125-1160.

Choniates, Niketas. *Nicetae Choniatae Historiae*. Edited by Jan-Louis Van Dieten. *Fontiam Historiae Byzantium*. Berlin: de Gruyer, 1975.

Chrysoloras, Manuel. Μανουὴλ Χρυσολωρᾶς. *Βίος, Ἔργα.* (Life, Works). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.156: 9-57.

Cyriac of Ancona. *Later Travels*. Edited and translated by E.W.Bonar with C.Foss, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Doukas, Michael. *Byzantinotourkike Historia, Keimena Byzantines Historiographias* (Byzantine/Turkish History, Byzantine Texts). Translated by Vrasidas Karalis. Athens: Ekdoseis Kanake, 1997.

Gregoras Nikephoros. *Byzantina Historia*. Edited by L.Schopen, 3 vols. (CSHB, 1829-55); German translation with commentary by J.L.van Dieten, Nikephoros Gregoras, *Rhomäische Geschichte*. Stuttgart, 1973.

Gregoras, Nikephoros. *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*. (Scriptural Body of Byzantine History). Edited by Auguste Immanuel Bekker and Barthold Georg Nieburhr. CSHB, Schopeni Edition. Bonn: University of Bonn. 1828/1897.

Gregoras, Nikephoros. Νικηφόρος Γρηγορᾶς. *Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἱστορίας Λόγοι.* (Roman History). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.14: 9-1501.

Homer. *The Odyssey*, Translated by E.V.Rieu. Revised translation by D.C.H.Rieu.

Introduction by Peter Jonas. London England: Penguin Books Ltd. 1946.

Kydonis, Dimitrios. *Περὶ τῶν βλασφημῶν δογμάτων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος*. (On Blasphemous Doctrines Gregory Palamas, and on the Procession of the Holy Spirit). *Patrologiae cursus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.154: 825-1216.

Mango, Cyril. *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies Three. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Meijer, Johan, C.Ss.R. *A Successful Council of Union*. A theological Analysis of the Photian Synod of 879-880. Thessaloniki: Analekta Vlatadon. Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1975.

Metochites, Theodore. *Essays*, edited by C.G.Muller and T.Kiessling, Theodore Metochitae Miscellanea philosophica et historia, Leipzig 1821.

Miklosich, Franz and Joseph Müller. *Acta Et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi: Sacra Et Profana, Collecta Et Edita*. (The acts and Diplomacy of the Greek Middle Ages: the Sacred and the profane, collected and published). 6 Aalen: Scientia Verlag 1968.

Pachymerae, Georgii. *Michael Palaeologus. Historis Rerum a Michaelae Palaeologus Ante Imperium et in Imperio Gestarum e bibliotheca Barberina interprete Petro Possino è Soc. Iesu, libri tres*, (Michael Palaeologus. Before and During the Empire of Michael Palaeologus and his Historical Exploits). Interpreter by Peter Possino, from the biblioteca Barberina and Soc. Jesus, three books, Romae: typis Barberinis excudente Fabio De Falco, 1669.

Palaiologos, Manuel II. Μανουήλ Β΄ Παλαιολόγος. Διάλογος ὃν ἐποίησατο μετὰ τινος Περσῶν. (Dialogue with Mohammedan). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.156: 81-581.

Philippides, Marios,. *Emperors, Patriarchs, and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373-1513: An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century*. The Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources, No. 13. Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1990.

Plethon, George Gemistos, Γεώργιος Γεμιστός Πλήθων, *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ Πραγμάτων*. (On the Peloponnisian Measures). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.160: 773-980.

Psellos, Michael, Μιχαήλ Ψελλός, *Περὶ Ψυχῆς*. (*De Anima*). *Patrologiae cusus Completus*. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, vol.122: 257-1441.

Scholarios, Georges. *Supplement Aux Oeuvres Polemiques. Response Aux Syllogisms De Marc d'Ephese Sur La Procession Du Saint- Esprit*. (Supplement polemical works. Response To Mark of Ephesus Syllogisms from On The Procession of the Holy Spirit). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, *Oeuvres Completes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios*. vol. III. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1930.

Scholarios, Georges. *Ouevres Oratoires. Traites Theologiques Sur La Providence Et Sur L'ame*. (Oratories Works. Theological treatises On Providence And On The soul). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, *Oeuvres Completes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios*. vol. I. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1928

———. *Traites Polemiques Sur La Procession Du Saint-Esprit*. (Polemical treatises On The Procession Of The Holy Spirit). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, Oeuvres Complètes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios. vol. II. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1929.

———. *Oeuvres Polemiques-Questions Theologiques. Ecrits Apologetiques*. (Polemic Works-Theological Questions. Writings Apologetic). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, Oeuvres Complètes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios. vol. III. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1930.

———. *Polemique Contre Plethon*. (Polemic Against Plethon). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, Oeuvres Complètes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios. vol. IV. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1935.

———. *Résumé de la Somme contre les Gentils et de la première partie de la Somme théologique, de saint Thomas d'Aquin*. (Resume of the Summary against the Gentiles and the first part of the Theological Summary of St. Thomas Aquinas). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides, Oeuvres Complètes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios. vol. V. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1931.

———. *Commentaire et résumés des ouvrages d'Aristote Résumés*, traductions et commentaries *thomistes*. (Comments and summaries of Aristotle Summaries works, translations and commentaries Thomist):

I. *Résumé de la I^a II^{ae}* (Summary of the 1st, 2^{ed})

II. *Traduction et commentaire du De Ente et essentia*. (Translation and Commentary of the On Being and Essence).

III. *Traduction du commentaire du De anima d'Aristote.*(Translation of commentary On the Soul of Aristotle).

Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides,*Oeuvres Completes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios.* vol. VI. Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1933.

———. *Commentaire et résumés des ouvrages d'Aristote.* (Comments and summaries of works of Aristotle). Louis Petit, Martin Jugie and Xenophon Siderides,*Oeuvres Completes De Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios.* vol. VII. Paris : Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1936.

Syropoulos, Silvestros. *Vera Historia Unionis Non Verae Inter Graecos Et Latinos: Sive Concilii Florentini Exactissima Narratio, Graece Scripta Per Sylvestrum Sguropulum Magnum Ecclesiarcham, Atque Unum e Quinque Crucigeris & intimis Consiliariis Patriarchae Constantinopolitani, Qui Concilio Interfuit* (True History of the Union that are not True, among the Greeks and the Latins: An Exact Narrative of the Discussions of the Council of Florence, by the Greek author Sylvestros Sguropoulos Great Ecclesiarch of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and his Intimate Counselors & Participants, One of the five, who took part in the Council). Edited by Robertus Creyghton (Hagae-Comitis: ex typographia Adriani Vlacq, 1660).

Syropoulos, Silvestros. *Les Mémoires Du Grand Ecclésiarque De L'Eglise De Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos Sur Le Concile De Florence (1438-1439)*.
(The Memoirs of the Great Ecclesiarch of the Church of Constantinople
Sylvester Syropoulos on the Council of Florence 1438-1439). Edited by V.
Laurent. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1971.

Villehardouin, Geoffrey. *Η Κατακτηση Της Κωνσταντινουπολης* (The Siege of
Constantinople) trans by Kosta Antipa in Greek, Athens: Hatzinikoli 1985.

Secondary Sources

Ambrosetti, Giovanni. *Diritto Naturale Christiano* (Natural Christian Law). Roma

Italia: Editrice Studium, 1970.

Angelov, Dimiter. *Imperial Ideology & Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204-1330*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Angelov, Dimiter and Saxby Michael. *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*. Edited

Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby. Society for the promotion of Byzantine

Studies-publication17. Farnham UK, Burlington VT USA: Ashgate Publishing

Ltd & Co, 2013.

Artz, Frederick B. *The Mind of the Middle Ages* Chicago: The University of Chicago

Press, 1953.

Babinger, Franz. *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*. Edited by William C.

Kickman. Translated from the German by Ralph Manheim, *Bollingen Series*,96.

Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Barbour, Hugh Christopher. *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His*

Translation of the Commentary of Armandus De Bellovisu on the De Ente Et

Essentia of Thomas Aquinas. Studi Tomistici,53. Città Del Vaticano: Libreria

editrice vaticana, 1993.

Barker, Ernest. *Social and Political thought in Byzantium, from Justinian I to the Last*

Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine writers and Documents ,Translations

with an Introduction and Notes by Ernest Barker. Oxford: at the Clarendon

Press, 1957.

- Barker, John W. *Manuel II Palaeologus 1391-1425: A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
- Barnes, Jonathan. *Porphyry Introduction* Translation with an Introduction and Commentary by Jonathan Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Bartusis, Mark C. *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204-1453*, Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Basileiadis, Nicholas. *St. Mark Eugenikos and the Union of the Churches*. Athens: The Theological Brotherhood Sotir, 1998.
- Blanchet, Marie Hélène. *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (Vers 1400-Vers 1472). Un Intellectuel Orthodoxe Face à La Disparition De L'Empire Byzantin* (Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (circa 1400-1472). An Intellectual Orthodox facing the Demise of the Byzantine Empire) Paris: Institut Français D'Études Byzantines, 2008.
- Bradshaw, David. *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Bryer, Anthony. 'The Roman Orthodox World 1261-1400'. In *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c 500-1492*. Edited by Jonathan Shepard, 852-880. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Brotto, G. and Caspare Zonta. *Acta Graduum Academicorum Gymnasii Patavini* (Journal Academics Degrees Gymnasii Patavini), Padova: Padova Antenore, 1969.

- Brown, Stuart. 'Christian Averroism, Fideism and the 'Two-fold Truth'. In *The Philosophy in Christianity*. Edited by Godfrey Vesey. *Royal Institute of Philosophy Lecture Series*: 25, 207-223. Canbridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Canellas, Juan Nadal. 'Gregoro Akíndinos' (Gregory Akindynos). In *La Théologie Byzantine et sa Tradition*: vol II Centre sous la direction de, Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello Vassa Conticello: Centre d'études des religions du Livre (Under the Direction by Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello Vassa Conticello: Centre of Studies for Religions of the Book), 191-256. Turnhout Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2002.
- Cheikh, Nadia Maria el. *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Copleston, Frederick S.J. *A History of Philosophy, Mediaeval Philosophy Part I Augustine to Bonaventure* vol. II. Garden City, New York: Image Books, Double Day & Co, 1962.
- . *A History of Philosophy: Mediaeval philosophy, Part II, Universal Hylomorphic Composition-Middle Ages*. vol.II. Garden City, New York: Image Books, Double Day & Co, 1962.
- Davies, Brian. *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Di Berardino, Angelo, and Basil Studer. *History of Theology*. vol. I. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Efthimiou, Miltiades B. *Greeks and Latins on Cyprus in the Thirteenth Century*.

Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1987.

Evdokimov, Paul. *Ages of the Spiritual Life*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998.

Fahey, Michael A. and John Meyendorff. *Trinitarian Theology East and West: St.*

Thomas Aquinas – St. Gregory Palamas. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1977.

Florovsky, Georges. *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Orthodox View*. vol. 1. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1972.

———. *Creation and Redemption*. vol.3. Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976.

Geanakoplos, Deno John. *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966.

———. *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282: a Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books 1973a.

———. *Byzantium and the Renaissance: Greek Scholars in Venice. Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1973b.

———. *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization Seen through Contemporary Eyes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

———. *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Gill, Joseph. *Church Union: Rome and Byzantium 1204-1453*. London. Variorum Reprints, 1979.

———. *Personalities of the Council of Florence, and Other Essays*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1964.

———. *Byzantium and the Papacy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979.

———. *The Council of Florence*. New York: AMS Press, 1982.

Hatzifoti, I.M. *Byzántio kai Ekklesiá. (Byzantium and Ekklisia)*. Athens: Apostolic Diakonias, 1978.

Hegel, George Wilhelm Friedrich and J. Sibree. *The Philosophy of History*. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.

Herrin, Judith. *Byzantium. The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Hladký, Vojtěch. *The Philosophy of Gemistos Plethon. Platonism in the Late Byzantium, between Hellenism and Orthodoxy*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1988.

Honderich, Ted. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford; New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Ierodiakonou, Katerina, ed. 'Psellos' Paraphrasis on Aristotle's *De interpretatione*'. In *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Sources*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 2002.

Imber, Colin. *The Crusade of Varna, 1443-5*. Aldershot: Ashgate 2006.

Kallistos, Bishop of Diokleia. *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Karamanolis, George. 'Plethon and Scholarios on Aristotle'. In *Byzantine Philosophy and its ancient Sources*. Edited by K. Ierodiakonou, 253-282. Oxford, 2002.

Kazhdan, Alexander Petrovich, and Annabel Jane Wharton. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: The Transformation of the Classical Heritage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985.

Kianka, Frances. *Demetrius Cydones (c.1324-c.1397): Intellectual and Diplomatic Relations between Byzantium and the West in the Fourteenth Century*. PhD Dissertation Paper, Fordham University, 1981.

Kustas, George L. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*. Thessaloniki: Patriachikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1973.

Laiou, Angeliki E, and Morrisson Cécile. *The Byzantine Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Livanos, Christopher. *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios : Alone Against All of Europe*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006.

Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Cambridge & London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 1968.

Louth, Andrew. *Greek East and Latin West. The Church AD 681-1071*. Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007.

- Macha, Josef. *Ecclesiastical Unification: A Theoretical Framework Together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 198. Roma: Institutem Orientalism Studiorum, 1974.
- Mango, Cyril. 'The Revival of Learning'. In *The Oxford History of Byzantium*. Edited by Cyril Mango, 214-229. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Mansel, Philip. *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453-1924*. First US edition. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Harpercollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism*. New York: Harpercollins, 1995.
- Mercati, Giovanni. *Notizie Di Procoro E Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca E Teodoro Meliteniota, Ed Altri Appunti Per La Storia Della Teologia E Della Letteratura Bizantina Del Secolo XIV* (News Of Prochorus And Demetrius Cidone, Manuele Caleca And Teodoro Meliteniota, And Other Notes To The History Of Theology And Byzantine Literature Of The Century XIV). Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1931.
- Metallinos, George D. *Τουρκοκρατία: Οι Έλληνες στην Οθωμανική Απολυταρχία* (Turkish Rule: The Greeks in the Ottoman Autocracy). Athens: Akritas, 1988.
- Meyendorff, John. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. First US edition. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974a.
- . *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.

- . *The Byzantine Legacy in the Orthodox Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.
- . *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998.
- Momoni, K.G. *Mark Eugenikos Life and Works*. Athens: University of Athens, 1954.
- Moutsopoulos, E. and Leonidas K Mpartzeliotis. Πλατωνισμός και Αριστοτελισμός κατά των Πληθωνα (Platonism kai Aristotelism according to Plethon). Athens: Foundation for Research and Editions of Modern Greek Philosophy, 1987.
- Necipoğlu, Nevra. *Byzantium Between the Ottomans and the Latins: Politics and Society in the Late Empire*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Nicol, Donald MacGillivray. *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453*. London: Hart-Davis, 1972.
- . *Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . *The Immortal Emperor: The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos Last Emperor of the Romans*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *The Reluctant Emperor: A biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine emperor and monk, 1295-1383*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Nicoloudis Nicholas. *Laonikos Chalkondyles*. A Translation and Commentary of the Demonstrations of Histories. Introduction, translated and commentary by Nicholas Nicoloudis. Athens: Stefanos D. Vasilopoulos, 1996.

Nichols, Aidan. *The Shape of Catholic Theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991.

Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth, Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.

Ostrogorsky, George. *History of the Byzantine State*. Revised Edition. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Page, Gill. *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity before the Ottomans*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Papadakis, Aristeides. *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

Papadakis, Aristeides and John Meyendorff. *The Christian East and the Rise of the Papacy: The Church 1071-1453 A.D.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994.

Papadopoulos, Stylianos G., n.d. *Ὁρθόδοξη Καὶ Σχολαστική Θεολογία (Orthodoxy and Scholastic Theology)*. Athens:[s.n.]

Papaioannou, Stratis. *Michael Psellos. Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development Doctrine. vol.I: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,1971.

———. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. vol. II:The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*. Chicago: Chicago University Press,1974.

———. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. vol. III. A History of the Development of Doctrine*. (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1978.

Pieper, Josef. *Guide to Thomas Aquinas*. Translated from German by Richard and Clara Winston. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991.

Podskalsky, Gerhard. *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: Der Streit um die Theologische Methodik in der Spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14.-15. Jahrhundert)*, (Theology and philosophy in Byzantium: The controversy over the theological methodology in the late Byzantine intellectual history (14th-15th century.) Seine Systematischen Grundlagen und seine Historische Entwicklung.Byzantinisches Archiv, Heft 15. (Its systematic foundations and its Historical Archive Entwicklung.Byzantinisches, Issue 15) Munich: Beck, 1977.

Psemmenos, Nikos K. *Η Ελληνική Φιλοσοφία από τὸ 1453 ὡς τὸ 1821* (The Greek philosophy from 1453 to 1821). 2 volumes. Philosophike Kai Politike Vivliotheke. Athens: Gnose, 1988.

Riche, Pierre. *The Carolingians*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

- Rigo, Antonio. 'Gregorio II Sinaita' (Gregory of Sinai). In *La Théologie Byzantine et Sa Tradition II*. Edited by Carmello Guiseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, 37-130. Belgium: Turnhout Brepols Publishers 2002.
- Romanides, Ioannes. *Ρομηνοσύνη, Ρωμανία, Ρούμελη*. (Romanicity, Roman, Roumeli). Thessaloniki: Pournares, 1975.
- . John S. Franks, *Romans, Feudalism and Doctrine: An Interplay between Theology and Society*. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.
- Rowe, William L, Wainwright Willaim J. *Philosophy of religion*. Selected Readings. 2nd edition. Olanda Florida USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1989/1973.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign: a Study of Tenth-Century Byzantium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- . *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1965.
- . *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence*. London: Cambridge University Press 1968.
- . *The Last Byzantine Renaissance, The Wiles Lectures, 1968*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . *Mistra: Byzantine Capital of the Peloponnese*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.

———. *History of the Crusades, the Kingdom of Acre and the Later Crusades*. vol. III.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Rautman, Marcus. *Daily Life in The Byzantine Empire*. Westport Connecticut:
Greenwood Press, 2006.

Setton, M. Kenneth. *Europe and the Levant in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*.
London: Variorum Reprints, 1974.

———. *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)*, volumn 1. The Thirteenth and
Fourteenth Centuries. Philadelphia: TheAmerican Philosophical Society, 1976.

Schein, Sylvia. *Fideles Crucis: The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy
Land, 1274-1314*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, Clarendon
Press, 1991.

Sherrard, Philip. *The Greek East and the Latin West: a Study in the Christian Tradition*.
London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Siniooglou, Niketas. *Radical Platonism in Byzantium: Illumination and Utopia in
Gemistos Plethon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. *Plato and Theodore. The Christian Appropriation of Platonic Philosophy and
the Hellenic Intellectual Resistance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2008.

Ševčenko, Ihor. *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World* London:
Variorum Reprints, 1982.

———. *The Palaeologan Renaissance*. In *Renaissances before the Renaissance: Cultural revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Age*. Edited by Warren Treadgold. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1984.

Sinkewicz, Robert E. 'The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Early Writings of Barlaam the Calabrian'. *Mediaeval Studies* 44. 180-242. Toronto Canada: Pontifical Institute of *Mediaeval Studies* 1982.

———. 'Gregory Palamas'. In *La Théologie Byzantine et Sa Tradition II*. Edited by Carmello Guiseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, 131-182. Belgium: Turnhout Brepols Publishers 2002.

Sopko, Andrew J. *Prophet of Roman Orthodoxy: the Theology of John Romanides*. Dewdney, B.C.: Synaxis Press, 1998.

Southern, R.W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970.

Stieber, Joachim W. *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire: The Conflict over Supreme Authority and Power in the Church, Studies in the History of Christian Thought*. vol.13. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Tinnefeld, Franz. *George Gennadios Scholarios*. Edited by Carmello Guiseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, 35-120. Belgium: Turnhout Brepols Publishers, 2002.

- Tomadakis, Nikolaos B. *Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος και Η Κρήτη κατά το 1400* (Joseph Bryennios and Crete around the 1400s). Athens: Bibliopoleiou E.G. Bagionaki, 1947.
- . *Περί Αλώσεως της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (1453)* (About the Fall of Constantinople). Thessaloniki: P. Pournara, 1993.
- Tsirpanlis, Constantine N. *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-Evaluation of His Personality*. New York: Κεντρον Βυζαντινων Ερευνων (Centre for Byzantine Research), 1979.
- Vasiliev, Alexander Alexandrovich. *History of the Byzantine Empire, 324-1453*. Second English edition. vol. II. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952.
- Vose Robin. *Dominicans, Muslims and Jews in the Medieval Crown of Aragon*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Williams, A.N. *The Ground of Union: Deification in Aquinas and Palamas*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Wilson, Nigel Guy. *Scholars of Byzantium* Duckworth Classical, Medieval and Renaissance Editions. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Woodhouse, C.M. *George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Zachariadou, Elisavet. A. *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Monteshe and Aydin (1300-1415)*. Venice: Istituto Elle NICO di Studi Bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia per tutti i paesi del mondo, 1983.

Zaharopoulos, Nikos T. *Η Εκκλησία στην Ελλάδα κατά τη Φραγκοκρατία* (Church in Greece under the Francokratia) Thessalonika: Pournara, 1981.

Zisis [Zeses], Theodoros. *Gennadios B' Scholarios*. Thessalonike: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikon Meleton, 1980.

Articles

Barrios, Georges. 'Palamism Revisited', *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 19. 4 (1975):211-231.

De Bolt, Darien C. 'George Gemistos Plethon on God: Heterodoxy in Defence of Orthodoxy', *Summary paper given at University of Oklahoma* (2006).

Demacopoulos, G.E. 'The Popular Reception of the Council of Florence in Constantinople'. *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 43. 1 (1999): 37-53.

Demetrakopoulos, J.A. 'Georgios Gennadios II – Scholarios' *Florilegium Thomisticum*. His early abridgment of various chapters and questiones of Thomas Aquinas' Summae and his anti-Plethonism, *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 69. (2002): 152-171.

Dennis, George. 'Reality in the Letters of Demetrius Cydones'. In *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides*. Edited by Charalambos Dendrinos et al., 401-10. Aldershot: Ashgate 2003.

Dennis, George. T. 'An Unpublished Funeral Oration on Manuel II Palaeologus 1425'. In *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides*, by Mathew (monk), 423-41. Aldershot: Ashgate 2003.

Duffy, John. 'Hellenic Philosophy in Byzantium and the Lonely Mission of Michael Psellos'. In *Byzantine Philosophy and its Ancient Source*.39.139-55. Edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Duro, Costache. 'Theology and Natural Science in St. Gregory Palamas'. Published in *God, freedom and Nature*. Edited by Ronald S. Laura, Rachel A. Buchanan, Amy K. Chapman, 132-138. Sydney-New York-Boston: Body and Soul Dynamics, 2012.

Fisher, Elizabeth A. 'Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for translation'. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 43 (2002/3): 77-104

Geanakoplos, Deno John. 'An Orthodox View of the Councils of Basel (1431-49) and of Florence (1438-39) as Paradigm for the Study of Modern Ecumenical Councils'. *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 30,3 (1985): 311-334.

Gill, Joseph. 'Eleven Emperors of Byzantium Seek Union with the Church of Rome'. *Eastern Churches Review*, 9. 1-2. (1977):72-84.

Gouillard, J. "Le Synodikon d'Orthodoxie: Édition et commentaire," *Travaux et Mémoires* 2 (1967):1-270.

Head, Constance, 'Manual Palaiologos, The Traveling Emperor'. In *Mankind the Magazine of Popular History*, 4. 3 (1973): 20-22.

Jugie, Martin. 'Georges Scholarios Et St Thomas D'aquin'. (Georges Scholarios and St Thomas D'Aquinas). *Melanges Mandonnet*. Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du Moyen Age, (1930) (*Mixes Mandonnet*. Literary Studies and Doctrinal History of the Middle Ages), (1930): 423-440.

Jugie, Martin. 'La polemique de Georges Scholarios contre Plethon'. (The Polemic of Georges Scholarios against Plethon). *Byzantion* 10 (1933): 517-530.

Karpozilos, Apostolos, D. *St Thomas Aquinas and The Byzantine East*. (De Essentia Et Operatione). *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 52, (1970):129-147.

Kustas, George L. 'The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric', in *Viator* 1 (1970): 55-74.

Laiou, Angeliki E. 'The Palaiologoi and the World around Them 1261-1400'. In *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c 500-1492*. Edited by Jonathan Shepard. 803-833. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Leontsini, Glycofrydi. 'Demetrius Cydones as a translator of Latin Texts'. In *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift Julian Chrysostomides*, 175-185. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing 2003.

Loenertz, Raymond and Peter Schreiner. 'Les Établissements Dominicains De Péra-Constantinople' (The Dominicans of Pera-Constantinople Establishments). In *Byzantina Et Franco-Graeca*. Roma Italy : Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura 1970 : 209-226.

Loenertz, Raymond. '*Theodore Et Andre Chrysoberges Et Les Negocations Pour L'Union Des Eglises Grecque Et Latine De 1415-1430*'. (Theodore and André Chrysoberges and negotiations for the Union of the churches of Greek and Latin-1415-1430). *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 24 (1954): 240-68.

Loenertz, Raymond. '*Fr Philippe De Bindo Incontri O.P.Du Couvent De Pera, Inquisiteur En Orient*'. (Fr Philippe De Bindo Incontri O.P. Of Convent of Pera, Inquisitor in the East). *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 24 (1954): 265-280.

- Lohr, Gabriel. 'Die Dominikaner an den Universitäten Erfurt und Mainz' (The Dominicans at the universities of Erfurt and Mainz). *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 23 (1953): 236-74.
- Lull, Ramon. 'Epistola Summo Pontifici Pro Recuperatione Terrae Sanctae' (The Letter of the Supreme Pontiff for the Recovery of the Holy Land). *Beati Magistri R. Lulli Opera Latina*. (1954): 270-82.
- Mauroudi, Maria. 'Plethon as Subversive and his Reception in the Islamic World'. In *Power and Subversion in Byzantium*. Edited by Dimiter Angelov and Michael Saxby: Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publication 17. 177-203. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2013.
- Papadakis, Aristeides. 'Ecumenism in the Thirteenth Century: The Byzantine Case'. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 27, 3 (1983): 207-217.
- . 'Byzantine Perceptions of the Latin West', *GOTR* 36 (1991).
- . 'Gennadius II and Mehmet the Conqueror', *Byzantion* 42 (1972): 88-106.
- Peritore, N. Patrick. *The Political Thought of Gemistos Plethon: A Renaissance Byzantine Reformer*. *Polity*, vol. 10, No. 2 (Winter, 1977).
- Raby, Julian. 'Mehmed the Conqueror's Greek Scriptorium'. In *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 37. 15-34. Washington DC: Harvard University, Dumbarton Research Library and Collection 1984.
- Schmemmann, Rev. Alexander. 'Byzantine Theocracy and the Orthodox Church'. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, I, 2 (1953): 5-22.

Smarnakis, Yannis. 'A Contribution to the Archaeology of Modern Utopian Thought: History and Utopia in Plethon's Oeuvre'. *Historein*, 7 (2007): 103-113.

Turner, Christopher J.G. 'George-Gennadius Scholarius and the Union of Florence'. *Journal of Theological Studies*. New Series 18 (1967): 83-103.

———. 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius'. *Byzantion* 39 (1969): 421-455.